


1984

# Dialect and Reading: The Question of Interference

Gertrude Tinker Sachs

Georgia State University, [gtinkersachs@gsu.edu](mailto:gtinkersachs@gsu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse\\_facpub](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub)

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Tinker Sachs, Gertrude, "Dialect and Reading: The Question of Interference" (1984). *Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications*. 24.

[https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse\\_facpub/24](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub/24)

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Middle and Secondary Education at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gsu.edu).

*Gertrude M. Tinker*

# **Dialect and Reading: The Question of Interference**

by

**Gertrude M. Tinker**

**Department of Education**

A Thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts in the  
University of Toronto

Copyright© 1984



### *Acknowledgements*

I wish to acknowledge the continued advice, support and friendship of Professor Dale Willows, my thesis supervisor and I acknowledge the assistance of Professor John McInnes, committee member.

To Marion Morgan, my typist and to all my friends, especially Jessica, I say a sincere thank you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .. .. .

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION .. .. .	1
	Statement of the Problem .. .. .	3
	Purpose of the Study .. .. .	4
	Scope and Delimitations .. .. .	5
II	BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM .. .. .	6
	Theoretical Background to the Problem .. .. .	8
	Language Acquisition .. .. .	8
	Language Development and Maturation .. .. .	10
	Phonological Development .. .. .	10
	Phonological Features .. .. .	12
	Development of Syntax .. .. .	16
	Grammatical Correlates .. .. .	19
	Development of Bidialectism .. .. .	29
III	LANGUAGE AND READING .. .. .	33
	The Reading Process .. .. .	35

CHAPTER		PAGE
IV	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .. .. .	39
	Primary Students and Oral Reading Tasks .. .	40
	Primary Students and Listening Comprehension Tasks .. .. .	45
	Primary Students and Silent Reading Tasks .. .	49
	Primary Students and Other Studies .. .	52
	Primary Students and Testing .. .	54
	Secondary Students and Reading .. .	56
	Conclusions .. .	60
V	IMPLICATIONS OF THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .. .	63
	Implications for Pedagogical Practice .. .	63
	Implications for Future Research .. .	71
	Conclusions .. .	74
	Concluding Remarks .. .	77
	REFERENCES .. .	80

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In the early sixteenth century, the Spanish established a huge colonial empire in the West Indies and America. In the process of seizing new lands they massacred nearly all the native Indian population. To obtain cheap manpower they began to bring African slaves who had proved their worth in Europe as capable and handy workers, to the New World.

(S. U. Abramova, 1979, p. 17).

The above quotation identifies the first in a series of actions that was to have an unparralled effect on the lifestyle of Black people in the New World. The institution of slavery wrought many changes for the newcomers. One of the first adaptations was the alteration of language to establish a means of communication. Faced with an onslaught of innumerable languages, a common medium of communication needed to be created for the newcomers and thus over a period of time pidginisation took place. Pidginisation refers to the formation of a language which has arisen as a result of contact between peoples of different languages, usually formed from a mixing of the languages (Adler, 1977 p. 12).

Pidginisation adapts words from one language for example English, to the phonological and grammatical patterns of the other language which was never spoken before the arrival of a pidgin. A pidgin is nobody's mother tongue and may become a permanent means of communication or may disappear when the need for it does

not exist any longer.

Today, there is still a great deal of controversy concerning the genesis of pidgins as well as their relationship historically and structurally with the English, French and Portuguese languages. However, it is widely held that Caribbean and Black American nonstandard forms of speech can be traced to a pidgin which emerged as a trade language along the West African coast at the beginning of the European expansionist movement (Alleyne, 1976).

In the New World, many of these pidgins survived and became creoles. Creolisation takes place when the pidgin survives for a longer period of time and children born in the area learn it in addition to their own language or instead of it (Adler, 1977). Creoles spoken by any group of people are "irregular languages" (Taylor, 1963) and each has its own phonemes, its grammatical conventions and vocabulary sufficient for the needs of its speakers. However, the creole is said to differ from a language with a long tradition because it has a much simpler grammar and is said to be free of historical fossils such as irregular verbs or plural of nouns (Adler, 1977). The American Negro dialects are said to be related to creolized forms of English which are today still spoken in parts of the Caribbean.

The evolution of language and the continual changes that all languages go through result in language differences. These language differences are transmitted by adults to their children. These

children go to school where they are taught to read and write to prepare them for life in society. It is believed by many educators, psychologists, linguists and researchers that language differences create problems in school for some children especially those Black children who speak a nonstandard variation of English. These differences are believed to create problems in reading which result in the failure of many subjects and subsequently school failure which ultimately limit the students' chances of success in society.

The scholastic performance of Blacks in the United States has always been surpassed by their White counterparts. Labov (1976) notes that Negro children do badly in all subjects including arithmetic and reading and that in reading, they average more than two years behind the national norm. He further states that the lag is cumulative so that they do worse comparatively in the fifth grade than in the first grade. The reading failure of Black nonstandard speakers has been attributed to their language which is said to be different from the language of instruction thereby creating interference problems (Baratz, 1969; Goodman, 1965; Labov, 1970; Rutherford, 1970; Seymour, 1973, Shuy, 1970; Spache, 1976; Stewart, 1970; Wolfram, 1970).

#### Statement of the Problem

This paper will address itself to the question of interference that is said to exist when nonstandard speakers attempt to read Standard English (SE). It will also examine the differences

in the features and structures of Black nonstandard English and SE and then attempt to determine from a review of the literature, whether language variations cause reading failure. Based on the review of the literature, conclusions will then be formulated and the direction for future research enunciated.

### Purpose of the Study

The repeated and continued academic failure of many Black children point to an area of need for which answers are not obvious. This study has been undertaken to focus on the possibility of dialectal interference which could be a source of reading failure for Black nonstandard speakers. There is a definite need to attempt to isolate factors which affect the performance of children in school so that where justifiable, measures could be taken to rectify and address the problem.

From an analysis of the research that has been done on non-standard dialect interference in reading, conclusions will be drawn which could then help to identify areas within the realms of the study that need to be further researched and simultaneously identify correlates of the problem of interference. The formulation of conclusions would also have implications for instructional strategies and methods for addressing the educational needs of non-standard English (NSE) speakers.

The study could possibly make a difference on the views of educators to the language and reading problems of nonstandard speakers by promoting knowledge, awareness and sensitivity and

ultimately affect changes in negative attitudes toward the problem of language differences and the school performance of NSE speakers.

#### Scope and Delimitations

The problem will be investigated from an analysis of research studies done within the United States, Caribbean and United Kingdom. The nonstandard language of the Black people of these areas have many common features and similarities hence generalizations could be made about the questions of applicability and relevance.

The bulk of the research on the problem however, has been done in the United States and even though there is an extreme paucity of studies on the problem emerging from the Caribbean and the United Kingdom, the conclusions of the American studies can be applicable to the other territories.



## CHAPTER II

### BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

The study of any language phenomenon cannot be viewed from a social vacuum as issues such as socioeconomics and attitudes affect the overall view of language behaviour. It is therefore important that one considers the sociological milieu against which the attitudes and perceptions of a language are formed. Some of these issues need to be identified and clarified as they relate to and affect the understanding of nonstandard dialect interference in reading.

There is firstly a need to recognize the close association between language and class. Carrington (1975) notes that no group of speakers of a dialect of Caribbean Atlantic English Creole developed political power or prestige over speakers of other dialects of the same language which as a consequence resulted in none of the creole dialects achieving the status of a standard dialect. Current research also shows that status assignment according to language affects citizens of all classes but it is the nonstandard English speaker who suffers most because such a person is usually poor and disadvantaged (Dillard, 1972). Ekwall (1973) further notes that Black Americans are also disproportionately represented on the lower end of the socioeconomic scale while Craig (1976)

states that social class classification would put most of the creole speakers within the levels of lower-working, working and lower middle class with those persons farthest from SE being at the lower rung of the scale. The nonstandard speaker therefore, in many instances, is economically disadvantaged or deprived and it is against this social background that the study of non-standard dialect and Black children's performance in reading have emerged.

Nonstandard language is not only considered a poor person's language, but it is also thought to be an inferior form of expression by many. In the 1960's, many inadequacies and deficiencies were enumerated and propagated by researchers and theorists on the nonstandard language of Black people (Bereiter and Engelmann, 1966; Bernstein, 1969; Black, 1965; Deutch, 1963; Engelmann, 1970; Jensen, 1969; Raph, 1967). However, the pioneering work of Labov (1967) and Joan and Stephen Baratz (1969) have led the way in establishing the foundations for the different but not deficient theory. The difference theory acknowledges that the Black non-standard dialect is different from that of other dialects in regular and rule-governed ways but that it is by no means deficient when compared to other languages as it has equivalent ways of expressing the same logical content (Labov, 1970). Feigenbaum (1970) reinforces this view by stating the following:

Languages have order; they are systematic; and it is impossible to find criteria for determining the relative values of two systems. This does not imply that any language

is as good or useful as any other in every situation. What this does mean is that, linguistically, no language system can be proven more or less valid than another (p. 88).

This study supports the difference theory and is based upon the principle that all languages are equivalent and possess universals which have been derived from the organizational similarities found in the surface structures and transformational rules (Slobin 1971).

#### Theoretical Background to the Problem

Languages go through similar processes of development. This means that despite differences in the content of languages, children go through similar processes or stages in acquiring various features and perceptions of languages. It is important to establish what the similarities of acquiring language are and subsequently show the different features of language that result.

#### Language Acquisition

The theories on language development fall into three basic categories which are biological, cognitive and behavioural. These theories place emphasis and predominance on differing aspects of the process of language acquisition and are basically in conflict concerning their views of man as a learning organism.

The biological theory of language development attributes the human specie with innate characteristics that predispose humans to search for phonological, syntactic and semantic categories and

*The innatist theory - Noam Chomsky*

relations that mark important linguistic generalizations in all languages. This ability is said to somehow be given in the nervous system of man. The fixed developmental schedule of linguistic and motor behavior (babbling, the word, then words followed by sentences etc.) are also said to be based upon specific neurophysical maturation which are unaltered by gross environmental factors (Lenneberg, 1966).

The cognitive theorists of language development such as Piaget, Vygotsky and Chomsky, maintain that early language acquisition is primarily dependent upon nonlinguistic cognitive development which means that the invariant sequence in cognitive development would account for whatever universality in language development is observed. As a result, language development universals are primarily based on semantics or, the belief that children use first those aspects of language that represent the meanings they need and are to convey and that these in turn are dependent upon cognitive development (Menyuk, 1977).

The sociocultural theorists place greatest emphasis on interaction with the environment. These theorists following the behaviourist tradition of B. F. Skinner (1957), believe that the acquisition of language is attributed to a stimulus--response relationship thereby implying that a particular type of environment might inhibit the acquisition of logical properties for an adequate language system (Wolfram and Fasold, 1974).

The aforementioned theories of language acquisition emphasize that all children are predisposed to acquiring language be it

cognitively socially or biologically. None of these factors however, is more important than the other as they all interact in their development and modify each other (Menyuk, 1977).

Children therefore experience similar stages in language development which account for similarities in phonological and syntactic features at various ages.

#### Language Development and Maturation

Language difficulties at various stages are due to physiological development, cognitive development and maturational and environmental factors. There is a need to be able to identify the difficulties that exist for most children at the various stages of development so that educators may not unwittingly attribute errors to dialectal differences when they may be maturational in origin.

#### Phonological Development

Children first learn sounds that are easiest to produce therefore the consonant *p* is one of the first phonemes to appear in children's speech because it is formed at the front of the mouth (McNeill, 1970b). Children by the age of 3 however, are said to have typically acquired a completed vowel system but by this age would be reducing many consonant clusters to *cv* (consonant + vowel). *Pla* would therefore become *pa* but this according to McCarthy (1954) would presumably have been accomplished by all children at about age 8. Consonant clusters however, provide

special problems for dialect speakers, and may not have been mastered until by the age of 8.

Palerno and Molfese (1972) note that children around the age of 5 have problems clearly pronouncing the *l* sound or the *r* as in ring. This is related to manipulation of the tongue. Similarly, young children experience difficulty in producing certain sounds in the medial position of certain words such as *lf* in *twelfth*. MacNeilage (1970) notes that sounds in the medial position of a word are the most difficult to pronounce even throughout childhood.

Sounds in the initial position of a word seem to create fewer errors in pronunciation than sounds in the final position which are more difficult. Hence one would find many children dropping the *ing* for many words. The dropping of the *ing* is a strong feature of nonstandard dialect but is also a feature exhibited in the speech of standard English speakers.

Phonological development provides a basis for later language development with the child growing to realize that a limited number of sounds can be combined in various ways to form words. Phonological development is closely related to regional or geographical differences and also community and ideolectic differences in pronunciation, accentuation and intonation. For the nonstandard dialect learner, differences in pronunciation due to environment, may produce a phonological development that differs from the phonological development of the standard dialect speaker and this

could create problems in the classroom if the influence of language differences is not taken into account.

The following are some of the common phonological features of nonstandard English that are said to be sources of interference in reading.

#### A. Phonological Features

##### 1. Simplification of Consonant Clusters

Phonologically, West African influence manifests itself in the structure of syllables resulting in consonant clusters being avoided in Standard English words. Labov (1969) says that this is one of the most common and complex variables in Negro Speech which could result in grammatical consequences. In addition to cases in which the reduction of consonant clusters occur similarly for NSE and SE speakers, there are cases in which the nonstandard Negro cluster reduction are different depending on surrounding sounds from Standard English. For example, in Standard English if a word ends in *st* and the following word begins with *s*, the *st* cluster is frequently reduced to *s* as in *Wesayd* (West Side). However, in nonstandard English, the cluster may be reduced whether or not the following word begins with *s* as in *Wesindiyz* (West Indies) Shuy (1968, p. 123). Some other common examples of consonant clusters are:

Standard English

*dentist*  
*wasp*  
*cold*  
*test*  
*rift*

Black English/Creole

*dentis'*  
*was'*  
*col'*  
*tes'*  
*riff*

2. Substitution of letters in  
the beginning, medial and  
terminal positions

This is a common feature of Black English and Creole and could have resulted from the tendency of hypercorrection or the impact of Standard English teaching resulting in a hypersensitivity of phonological features. Examples are:

<i>th</i>	
<u>SE</u>	<u>BE/Creole</u>
<i>brother</i>	<i>brudder</i>
<i>this</i>	<i>dis</i>
<i>V and W</i>	
<i>volleyball</i>	<i>wolleyball</i>
<i>wait</i>	<i>vait</i>
<i>seven</i>	<i>sebin</i>

3. Vowel Mergers before r

This is another common feature of Black English which results in a larger number of homophones in BE than in SE. However, SE regional variations in speech result in many phonological differences which also create regional and social homophones. Some examples of vowel mergers are:

<u>SE</u>	<u>BE</u>
<i>fear</i>	<i>fir</i>
<i>tore</i>	<i>tar</i>
<i>ear</i>	<i>ir</i>
<i>gir</i>	<i>er</i>
<i>tour</i>	<i>tur</i>



4. R-lessness

Labov (1969) cites three major dialect areas in the Eastern United States where the *r* of certain words is not pronounced. These are Eastern New England, New York City and the South. In recent years due to the influence of the media, a more mixed pattern is now observed. The original *r - less* pattern is observed in the following:

<u>SE</u>	<u>BE/Creole</u>
<i>guard</i>	<i>god</i>
<i>gnaw</i>	<i>nor</i>
<i>sore</i>	<i>saw</i>
<i>par</i>	<i>pa'</i>

5. l-lessness

This tendency among some Blacks also creates homophones such as

<u>SE</u>	<u>BE/Creole</u>
<i>toll</i>	<i>toe</i>
<i>help</i>	<i>hep</i>
<i>fool</i>	<i>foo</i>
<i>all</i>	<i>awe</i>

6. Weakening of Final Consonants

Unstressed final vowels and weak syllables show fewer distinctions and more reduced phonetic forms than initial consonants and stressed vowels. Final *d* and *t* are most affected by this and could possibly create problems in the marking of tenses. Examples are:

<u>SE</u>	<u>BE/Creole</u>
<i>boot</i>	<i>boo</i>
<i>road</i>	<i>row</i>
<i>feed</i>	<i>feet</i>
<i>bit</i>	<i>bid</i>

7. Inflectional Endings -s, -ing

The existence of underlying nonstandard forms makes it difficult for some Black speakers to create the plural for words ending in *st*, *sk*, *sp* and *ing*. The tendency is also there to firstly , simplify the consonant cluster thus creating:

<u>SE</u>	<u>BE/Creole</u>
<i>desks</i>	<i>desses</i>
<i>tests</i>	<i>tesses</i>

In *ing* endings of the present participle the *g* is omitted such as in:

<i>talking</i>	<i>talkin'</i>
<i>singing</i>	<i>singin'</i>

The phonological differences attributed to the creation of homophones, and the omission and deletion of letters may very well create problem areas in the pronunciation and spelling of SE words. However, as Labov (1967) points out, "The existence of homophones on the level of a phonetic output does not prove that speakers would have the same set of merges at the abstract level which corresponds to on spelling system" (p. 47). Phonological differences also operate at the surface level and may not necessarily affect comprehension.

### Development of Syntax

Some researchers contend that by the age of 5 years, children have acquired all of the basic rules present in the adult language system and are able to communicate fairly well (Menyuk, 1968b). However, Anastasiow, Hanes and Hanes (1982) believe that much language is acquired after the age of 5 particularly increased knowledge of words and word meanings. According to Anastasiow et al (1982), children's language is not a simplified version of adult language but that it goes through very predictable stages from the one word sentences to multi-word sentences and that between the ages of 5 and 12 years, improvements in the co-ordination of adjectives, nouns, and predicates, along with adverbial clauses and infinitive clauses appear in children's language. Many children's early sentences are similar in structure to those of adults yet frequently many of the function words are omitted. Function words refer to articles (*the, an*), connectives (*and, because*), auxiliary verbs (*have*), copula verbs (*be*), and inflections (*-ing*).

Brown (1973), contends that functions are not present in early speech patterns because they are difficult to acquire. Functions such as auxiliary verbs, copula verbs and inflections create special problems for the NS speakers and while not present in younger nonstandard dialect speakers due to maturation, it can be argued that the forms are exhibited in older nonstandard dialect speakers but used differently when compared to standard dialect

speakers because of language differences.

Children go through similar stages in their development of appropriate verb forms. Many young children produce sentences such as. *He comed home* and *She wented to the store*. Anastasiow et al (1982) contend that it takes a long time (into the fifth and sixth year of life) for a child to learn the common irregular verbs and into late elementary school to learn some others such as (*swum* and *drank*). Children tend to over-generalize and regularize verb forms for an extended period of time and Anastasiow et al (1982) state that this suggests that children are attempting to develop a rule system to govern the production of linguistic expressions in a variety of situations. For the nonstandard dialect language learner, the impact of instruction in the standard medium increases over-generalization moreso than it might for the standard learner and it could also affect over-generalization for a longer period of time in the NS speaker as he/she may be experiencing more interference from the already internalized language system of the home.

Chomsky and Halle (1967) establish that although dialects are forms of language similar in many respects, they differ in some ways generated by the addition and/or deletion of one or more rules in the grammar, a different ordering of the rules and a simplified form in some dialects of a rule applying in others. There will then be some interference in the process of acquiring the rules of Standard English and as the speaker tries to recall

rules, some confusion may result and create interference in the acquisition of SE rules.

③ In the acquisition of pronouns, young children use proper names when adults would use pronouns (Bloom, 1970; Hurley, 1970; Menyuk, 1969) but as the children learn more about their environment, there is a developmental trend to move from general to specific. In the creole language of the NS speaker, there is no case system in either noun or pronoun and no indication of personal pronouns. This rule may interfere with the rules in SE but should not create comprehension problems as pronoun referents are still used in NS consequently some transfer is facilitated.

In the acquisition and development of syntax children experience many other language problems such as in understanding and using negation, the distinction between reversible and irreversible sentences and in the production of complex sentences.

Very little information exists on the cross development and acquisition of the aforementioned forms by both SE and NSE speakers but it can be hypothesized that the problems of acquiring SE features would be greater for NSE speakers than SE language users as variations in the two dialects will produce conflicts. The following are the common grammatical features of BE and Creole which may be evidenced in the speech of the nonstandard speaker.

## B. Grammatical Correlates

### 1. The Possessive and Pronouns

Possession is indicated by position and context and not by the standard possessive marker 's. In some cases, this absence can be interpreted as a reduction of consonant clusters. In the case of *r*, two possessive pronouns which end in *r* have become identical to the personal pronoun. For example, *their* becomes *dey* and *your* becomes *you*. *Own* is also used where SE uses a possessive pronoun or *s* after a noun. For example:

<u>SE</u>	<u>Creole</u>
<i>This is ours.</i>	<i>Dis we own.</i>
<i>That is mine.</i>	<i>Das my own.</i>

There is seldom a distinction between masculine and feminine as in SE. As previously mentioned, there is no case system in either noun or pronoun in Creole and no indication of personal pronouns. *e* probably from *he*, means *his*, *her* and sometimes *their*. For example.

<u>SE</u>	<u>Creole</u>
<i>That is their house.</i>	<i>Das 'e house.</i>
<i>The blue one is her /</i> <i>his car.</i>	<i>Da blue one is 'e cah.</i>

Other features like the invariable pronominal system and the use of juxataposition to express possession are common throughout the Caribbean and are also characteristic of universals of popular language development Alleyne (1976). Examples are:

SE

Creole

*My daddy's book*

*Mi dadi book*

*These belong to my sister. Dese my sister tings.*

2. The Copula

The close relationship between Caribbean Creole and Black English becomes more apparent when one examines the use of the copula in the two dialects. Shilling (1978) states that amongst some Bahamian mesolect speakers there are patterns of variable copula deletion which are described by Labov (1969). Labov believes that the absence of the copula is seriously affected by phonological processes. For example SE *I'm* becomes *I*, *you're* becomes *you* and *we're* becomes *we*. The absence of the copula is a general feature of Creole and is deleted before the predicate adjective. Thus, for example:

SE

Creole

*This generation is too lazy. Dis generation too lazy.*

*My orange is big. My own big.*

The copula is also deleted before *ing*, and before adverbial and prepositional phrases. For example:

SE

Creole

*I'm in a big hurry.*

*I in a big hurry.*

*They are early.*

*Dey early.*

*He is singing and playing.*

*He singin' and' playin'.*

The copula is also deleted after the subject. For example:

<u>SE</u>	<u>BE/Creole</u>
<i>This dress is too small.</i>	<i>Dis dress too small.</i>
<i>My friend is in the classroom.</i>	<i>My friend in da classroom.</i>

A distinctive feature of Jamaican Creole is the substitution of *deh* for the copula when used before location. For example:

<u>SE</u>	<u>Creole</u>
<i>He is in the back of the yard.</i>	<i>He deh in da back of da yard.</i>
<i>Who is in the house?</i>	<i>Who deh in da house?</i>

The absence of the verb *to be* could create some oral reading problems for BE students who may omit or insert their internalized versions of the verb.

### 3. The Present Tense

In the use of the present tense, there is an absence of subject-verb concord. Beryl Loftman Bailey (1966) notes that this is a very distinctive feature of creole and Black English. Thus, for example we would hear the following:

<u>SE</u>	<u>BE/Creole</u>
<i>I get up early.</i>	<i>I gets up early.</i>
<i>We go to church on Sunday.</i>	<i>We is go to church on Sunday.</i>
<i>We live in the city.</i>	<i>We does live in da city.</i>
<i>I do that all the time.</i>	<i>I does dat all da time.</i>
<i>Where are they?</i>	<i>Whey dey is?</i>
<i>I work here.</i>	<i>I works here.</i>

Note that the suffix *s* occurs in the present tense first person singular. It is also formal regardless of numbers and persons as an habitual marker meaning that the action occurs regularly.



Occurring everywhere in Creole dialects are the use of *bin*, *gone*, *did* and *done* to mark the past tense.

SE

*I was in town yesterday.  
He wanted to come home.  
Lucy has been gone a long  
time.  
The baby had eaten by the  
time I arrived.*

Creole

*I bin in town yesterday.  
He did wan come home.  
  
Lucy bin gone a long time.  
The baby did done eat when  
I reach. .*

*Did* is also used to show that one action preceded another. For example:

SE

*When I reached home  
Danny had cleaned the yard.*

Creole

*When I reach home Danny  
did done clean the yard.*

*Gone* is also used to express a simple past in Creole. For example:

SE

*He went to the shop*

Creole

*He gone to the shop*

The use of *get* is a common feature of Caribbean nonstandard dialects. According to Alleyne (1976) *get* occurs with verb forms in the passive voice. When the earlier passive rule ceases to be general, *get* occurs before verbs and adjectives. For example one would hear the following:

SE

*The tree has been cut.  
The eggs have been sold.  
The water is getting hot.*

Creole

*Da tree cut/Da tree get cut.  
Da egg sell/Da egg get sell.  
Da water hottin/Da water  
gettin/hot*

### Use of Be

*Be* is used as a main verb in Bahamian dialect occasionally with *S*. It replaces Standard English *is*, *am* and *are* and expresses habitual action. In the creole lexicon, *be* is an equating verb and a locating verb with no reflex for adjectival predication. Alleyne (1976) states that this is a common feature of the Caribbean with the exception of the island of Jamaica. Example are as follows:

#### SE

*He's always sick.*  
*She is at home on Fridays.*  
*We play after school.*  
*I am there often.*

#### Creole

*He does be sick.*  
*She be's home on Fridays.*  
*We be playing after school.*  
*I be's dere often.*

### 4. The Past Tense Marker

In American Black English and Caribbean Creoles, phonological processes are active in reducing the frequency of the occurrence of the *t* and *d* of Standard English past tense forms. For example:

#### SE

*past/passed*  
*missed*  
*find*  
*called*  
*walked*

#### BE/Creole

*pass*  
*miss*  
*fine*  
*call*  
*walk*

Shilling (1978) reports that in the Bahamas action verbs mean past tense when the stem form is used but that in most cases the *ed* is seldom used by Bahamian nonstandard speakers. One would therefore hear the following:

#### SE

*Did you see Peter last week?*  
*I ate there before.*

#### Bahamian dialect

*You see Peter las' week?*  
*I eat dere before.*

## 5. The Future Tense

The loss of final *l* may have an effect on the realization of future forms. If *you'll* in SE is equivalent to *you* in Creole or *they'll* is equivalent to *they*, the *l*-lessness could produce comprehension interference in time relationships. However, in many cases the colloquial future is identical with the colloquial present. In BE the first person *I'm a shoot you* is preserved but in Bahamian dialect and the Creoles of many of the islands, the future is expressed by the *going* which becomes *gon* plus a verb. For example:

### SE

*Where are you going to  
be this evening?  
What time will the food  
be ready?*

### Creole

*Where you gon be t's evenin'?*  
*What time dis food gon be  
ready?*

The passive voice is not found in the Creole verb form (Bailey 1966) and as a result SE *he was seen* would come near to being expressed in the forms of the present or the past tense such as *dey see him* or *dey say dey see him*, with quantifiers to give more information.

The differences in the use of tenses could pose some problems for the nonstandard dialect reader. Problems could arise in the area of comprehension if the student fails to make use of surrounding context clues.

## 6. Negation

The Creole dialect negation system is almost identical to that of Black English. Labov (1972) gives *don't* as a present negative

but mentions that *ain't* is also a possible as it is more of a general feature of creoles with the exception of the Jamaican Creole (Alleyne 1976). The negative forms *is*, *are*, *am* and auxiliaries *have* and *has* become *ain't* or *to be*, the result of the phonetic development of *didn't*. Verbs may therefore be negated with either *don't* or *ain't*. Examples are as follows.

<u>SE</u>	<u>Creole</u>
<i>He's seldom at home.</i>	<i>He does don't be home.</i>
<i>Mary doesn't eat crabs.</i>	<i>Mary don't eat crabs.</i>
<i>Ain't as a negative</i>	
<i>He doesn't want that.</i>	<i>He ain't wan dat.</i>
<i>Papa isn't eating his food.</i>	<i>Papa ent (ain't) eatin' he food.</i>
<i>Ain't before non-verbal predications</i>	
<i>He isn't sick.</i>	<i>He ain't sick.</i>
<i>They aren't there.</i>	<i>Dey ain't dere.</i>

#### Don't and Be

*Don't* and *be* are used as negatives to show habitual action without regard for number and person. These are said to be morphophonemically based on SE but syntactically based on early Afro-American forms occurring throughout the Caribbean. Examples are:

<u>SE</u>	<u>BE/Creole</u>
<i>He doesn't go to school every day.</i>	<i>He don go to school errie day.</i>
<i>My baby is never sick.</i>	<i>My baby does don be sick.</i>

### Double Negation

Labov (1970) calls this negative concord a striking feature of Black English and Caribbean dialects. Examples are:

#### SE

*He isn't anybody.  
I don't have anywhere to  
sleep.  
She is not a fool.*

#### BE/Creole

*He ain't nobody.  
I ain't got no place to sleep.  
She is not no fool.*

Double negation is also a common feature of SE and the problems which result from negation on a whole, would find similar duplications in standard English forms.

The preceding differences in syntax account for the area where the variation in SE and NSE are greatest. It has been shown that equivalent forms of SE syntactic structures are found in NSE. This could create interference in the processing of tenses by the NSE speaker which may or may not (depending on context) interfere with meaning.

### Development of Semantics

In a review of the literature on language development in children after the age of 5, Palermo and Molfese (1972) concluded that significant changes in language development and shifts in the child's semantic system are correlated with transitional periods in cognitive development. The belief that cognitive processes are instrumental in the development of a fully-functioning meaning system is also a conclusion of McNeil (1970a). McNeil has described two basic processes in the development of a meaning

system which are also supported by Clark (1973a) and Anglin (1970). The development of meaning by McNeil (1970a) is seen from the mastery of horizontal structuring (where one word for example *flower*, means all kinds of *flowers*) to vertical structuring (where one word belongs to a more abstract category such as *flower* belonging to the category of *living plants*).

Studies done by both Clark (1973a) and Anglin (1970) cite the conflict which exists in how researchers view the stages of the development of semantics. Development is said to proceed from generalization to specificity (Clark, 1973a) or from specificity to generalization (Anglin, 1970). Although the controversy remains unsettled both developments are said to occur (Menyuk, 1977) and researchers agree that cognition and maturational factors play vital roles in the acquisition of semantics.

Consistent with cognitive development are processes that continue through childhood and into adulthood. These processes are related to observing abstract relations between words which are based on understanding lexical items appropriately within sentences and consciousness of the meaning and use of lexical items (Anglin, 1970). These are later developments of middle and later childhood years but are not necessarily abilities that are employed by all adults.

In younger children, the acquisition of meaning seems to precede production (Menyuk, 1971) as the infant need not imitate or utter a word before s/he comprehends it. However when children begin to produce words, growth is rapid from 50 words at 1 1/2

receptive  
vocabulary  
expressive  
vocabulary

to about 2,500 words at 6 1/2 (Smith, 1926). Despite this growth however, children's comprehension lexicon may exceed their productive vocabulary,

Children also move from the concrete (nouns and verbs) to the more abstract (adjectives etc.) in their development and comprehension of meaning. Similarly, the ability to give more abstract meanings also develops over a period of time (Werner and Kaplan, 1968). Within sentences, children move through stages of simple to more complex acquisitions such as from subject-object relationships to understanding relationships expressed by various types of conjoined and embedded sentences Menyuk (1971).

For nonstandard speakers, the acquisition of semantics is similar to standard speakers but in attempting to acquire meanings for unfamiliar SE words NSE speakers may be at a disadvantage if these words are not a part of their lexicon. However, all language users face the hurdle of unfamiliar words in reading and strategies must be developed to remedy the situation. The lexicon of SE and BE are not far apart as assimilation and convergence have occurred with many of the terms. There are some exceptions in the Caribbean however where penetration and influence of SE have not taken toll on some of the original lexical items such as the following:

Creole

*nyam*  
*jook*

*yuck*

SE

*to eat*  
*to stab*

Thus for some Caribbean nonstandard dialect speakers, lexical differences may contribute to interference in the comprehension of words where context clues are not provided.

The differences that exist in the language of NSE are mainly surface level in nature. It is possible that interference could be created for NSE speakers who come in contact with SE structures and internalize them. Having access to both forms of English facilitates the reconstruction of meaning but probably creates an interference in the process particularly at the syntactic level. A look at the development of bidialectism may help to gain an understanding of how NSE speakers acquire this skill.

#### Development of Bidialectism

Joan Baratz (1970) conducted a study using third and fifth grade Black and White students from schools in Washington, D.C. Using sentence repetition tasks as measures for bidialectism, Baratz summarized that there are two dialects involved in the education of nonstandard speakers and that Black children are generally not bidialectal because interference took place when the students attempted to use SE. Many studies have since concluded that Black children are bidialectal in that they are able to code-switch and code-mix at very early ages (Ramer, 1973; Simons, 1974; Sims, 1982; Troutman, 1982).

Code-switching is dependent upon factors such as maturation, language processing strategies and communicative competence. These factors are also operational in code-switching



from one language to another. Erwin Tripp (1974) has noted that older second language learners have the advantage of processing more efficient memory heuristics and greater knowledge than younger children as older children learn word combinations faster than younger children and can map new vocabulary into storage more efficiently. Older language users then, are therefore more equipped to handle bidialectal communication strategies than younger children thereby implying that older students may be at an advantage when compared with younger students in acquiring both dialectal features and in being more metacognitively aware of language.

Maturation and language processing strategies are dependent upon the development of language and vice-versa and as children mature, their strategies for language use are applied to new domains. A shift may occur in sentence--processing strategies, from surface to deep structure analysis because of the development of the ability to apply a set of corrections to the gestalt (Mehler, 1971). Similarly, as children become more skilled and automatic bidialectal users, they become more competent in transferring strategies from one dialect to the other. This could also result in confusion in the earlier stages and result in inteference or mixing within one of the dialects. Bidialectal speakers, may or may not become perceptive or competent enough to separate and classify the unique features of each dialect which could then result in interference in reading.

Communicative competence requires the ability to produce utterances of a certain form in particular situations. That is, a form that conveys the intended meaning of the speaker and is maximally useful to the listener (Menyuk, 1977). This development appears to take place during middle and later childhood as an ability to analyze consciously the relations and rules that have been established between the linguistic repertoire and the contextual organization. Young nonstandard speakers entering school for the first time may be more equipped to converse in NSE than SE but as they become more experienced language users they will naturally acquire some of the features of SE and will learn where and when certain dialect features are more appropriate.

The successful acquisition of bidialectism is also dependent upon attitudes and motivation and individuality. Therefore the skill may become more or less pronounced as one gets older. Cross analysis may also convey conflicting results as there is individual variation in the way in which learners acquire structures of the second language (Cancino, Rosanky and Schumann, 1974; 1975; and Hakuta, 1975). Some people may therefore become skilled bidialectal users acquiring the skill at various or different stages in life or never at all.

The question can be raised as to whether the skill of bidialectism facilitates expediency in reading acquisition if it were to be found that dialect definitely creates an interference. If this were to be true, then it would be appropriate to establish the need for studies and research in the acquisition and development

of bidialectism and how it alters or affects the reading of SE materials.

The issue of bidialectism is one that has a sparsity and paucity of research. While the issue is of extreme importance to this paper, the development of the skill goes beyond the scope of this thesis and will not be dealt with beyond the boundaries of the problem. Attempts will be made to address the issue where relevant but for more depth and scope, further studies are needed.

This chapter has presented an overview on the background necessary for understanding the nature of the problem of interference. It has noted that the problem has many sociological attachments but that many of them are ill-founded as all languages are equivalent despite the association that exists between nonstandard forms and class.

The chapter has established that regardless of language most children go through similar stages of language acquisition and development even if different languages result. The major differences between SE and NSE forms were also presented.

The issue of bidialectism was also discussed and the need for further studies in the area emphasized.

With this background of language development, it is essential to show its relationship to the task of reading. The following chapter will attempt to form the connection between the two areas.

## CHAPTER III

### LANGUAGE AND READING

. . . to completely analyze what we do when we read would almost be the acme of a psychologist's achievements for it would be to describe very many of the most intricate workings of the human mind, as well as to unravel the tangled story of the most remarkable specific performance that civilization has learned in all its history (Huey, 1968, p. 6).

Huey's perceptions sum up the difficulty of trying to accurately describe what takes place during the act of reading. Many attempts have been made to describe what processes and factors are contributory to the development of reading skills but researchers and theorists still have a long way to go in unravelling the complexity of the task of reading and in stating what happens where and when and under what conditions. Mass literacy is a phenomena of the late nineteenth century and there are still some countries or areas with little or no literacy but yet in so short a period of time, man has pioneered many successful expeditions into analyzing the processes involved in reading and noting some of the factors tantamount to success in reading.

The literature presents considerable evidence in support of the close relationship between language and reading. Venezky (1978) describes language as one of the factors crucial to preparation for reading because all children come to the reading

task with differing experiences and expectations and can use language to communicate with adults and peers. Through the medium of language, children are able to communicate their intent and meaning of the written word (Cazden, 1981). Language also makes possible most of the complex forms of cognitive functions (logic) and in this regard, the contributions of Jean Piaget have been particularly significant as he and his colleagues have added much clarity and coherence to the understanding of the relationship between language and intellectual operations.

The use of language facilitates familiarity with the language of books and other language oriented skills. Stouffer (1975) states that:

Oral language on actions that are content-bound and context-bound and proceed from the egocentric to the sociocentric provide a sound foundation for the transfer of language power to printed language, or reading to other language skills whose components are listening, speaking, writing and spelling. Reading weaves in and out among them all and it paves the way for achievement in all areas (p. 21).

Oral language therefore acts as the initiation or basis of reading which in turn creates channels for success in all interrelated areas.

The roots of thought and language cognitively and linguistically, have a universality among all peoples thereby providing and fostering a transfer of skills expertise and knowledge from one group to another through a common medium of reading.

Language is thus of extreme importance in the promotion of literacy but yet its means of acquisition are completely different from reading for while all societies have language, all do not have literacy. Language and reading share similar vocabulary and grammatical forms but despite their similarities poor readers are often produced. Conversely, good readers sometimes result when grammatical forms differ from language and reading. What causes this discrepancy? Is it the language variation or other factor(s)? The next section of this chapter may help to shed some light on the processes involved in reading and why it is apparently so difficult to be attained by some.

### Reading Process

The process of reading has been under close scrutiny since the pioneering and auspicious work of Cattell (1886) and Huey (1908). The processes identified at that time such as the movement and fixation of the eyes in the visual processing of text and the importance of the roles of memory and perception, are still under observation today. These and other related processes of reading have been translated and transformed into definitions and models of reading for greater expediency, conciseness and clarity in describing processes which could otherwise be problematic and cumbersome exercises in comprehension.

Kenneth Goodman (1967) has presented the most flexible and usable definition of the reading process. Rather than being a precise process, he defines it as a "selective process involving

partial use of available minimal language cues selected from perceptual input on the basis of the reader's expectations" (p.127).

As this partial information is processed, tentative decisions are then made to be confirmed, rejected or refined as reading progresses. Reading has been interpreted by Goodman (1968) as "a series of guesses, tentative information processing" (p. 19). The guessing while appearing to be intuitive is facilitated by knowledge so well learned, that its access has become automatic thereby requiring little thought.

Automaticity takes place as the reader develops and acquires cues to unlock the written code and arrive at meaning. For the nonstandard reader in the early stages of reading, automaticity could be delayed or slowed down by interference in the visual processing and perception of graphic stimuli which could be the result of a different oral sound symbol correspondence. This however, depends upon the degree of difference between the two systems.

The information or clues which helps to facilitate automaticity and reading acquisition has created much dissension and controversy among reading theorists and educators. The order and form of the presentation of information has been the major areas of disagreement. Models have been designed by Goodman (1976), Gough (1976), Laberge and Samuels (1976), Rudell (1976), and Chall (1982) to name only a few. These and other models have been designed by theorists who fall into the divisional and some-

times overlapping camps of which method should be used to help children gain access to this reading knowledge referred to earlier. There are the psycholinguists, the linguists, the phoneticians, the whole-word and language-experience followers to name just a few of the many popular appellations.

The controversy of this decade has been centred mainly among the psycholinguistics and developmentalists views of acquiring reading. Carroll, Samuels, Laberge and Chall are among the developmentalists who are the proponents of the *bottom-up* method of reading acquisition.

Smith and the Goodmans are the pioneers of the psycholinguistic method or the *top-down* method of acquiring reading. They believe that children learn to read naturally by reading. These theorists view the acquisition of reading skills by children as being similar to that of the processes used by adults. The psycholinguistic method has gained much popularity among educators for its aura of simplicity, flexibility, intuitiveness and naturalness.

Despite the conflicts that exist in how reading should be taught, the processes involved in reading and in acquiring reading remain complex and no one method has all the answers. For the non-standard speaker, the processes would be even more complex if interference were found to be evident. It could mean that more processing strategies would need to be studied for such persons and it could also mean greater delays in acquiring the skill of reading.



This chapter has looked briefly at the close relationship between language and reading and some of the important processes involved in the acquisition of reading. It has established that reading is a language related process which involves the interaction of various skills to attain automaticity and meaning. For the nonstandard speaker language differences could slow down the attainment of certain skills. A review of the studies done on interference will demonstrate whether language variations create problems in the attainment of reading skills.

## CHAPTER IV

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON THE QUESTION OF INTERFERENCE

From the sixties to the present, a number of studies have been done in attempts to demonstrate the influence or noninfluence of language differences in reading. There are researchers and theorists who believe that language differences promote interference thereby creating problems in reading for nonstandard speakers and there are those who believe that the speech of nonstandard speakers does not create interference. Another group of researchers and theorists believe that the entire issue is at a stalemate because the issue is surrounded with conflicting data. The following review will attempt to formulate some conclusions on the question of interference as it relates to the performance of BE speakers on the reading of SE and/or BE materials.

More than half of the studies related to dialect interference have utilized mainly primary school children as their subjects (Andreacchi, 1973; Balaban, 1973; Cagney, 1977; Copple and Black, 1974; Fins, 1975; Frentz, 1971; Hall and Turner, 1971; 1972a; 1972b; Faber, 1977; Jaggar, 1972; Lui, 1975-76; Marwit and Neumann 1975; Mathewson 1974; Malmed, 1972; Nolen, 1972; Osser, Wang and Zaid, 1969; Ramsey, 1972; Sims, 1976; Simons, 1974; Simons and

Johnson, 1974) while little attention has been given to the intermediate and senior school students (Bartel and Axelrod, 1969; Edwards, 1981; Labov, 1970; Ramer and Rees, 1973; Reynolds, Taylor, Steffenson, Shirley and Anderson, 1972). This large imbalance could be attributed to the belief that reading is a skill acquired in the primary school years and because the features of BE are most characteristic among young speakers so that children face learning problems when their speech is different from the standard form (Dillard, 1967, Stewart, 1969).

The review will present first the studies of the primary aged children divided into sub-divisions by the major task of the experiment such as oral reading, listening comprehension or silent reading. Studies on the secondary students will be discussed following the primary students.

#### Primary Students and Oral Reading Tasks

Oral reading tasks allow teachers to hear how children read. These tasks would exhibit areas of weaknesses and strengths particularly at the decoding level. For nonstandard speakers, oral reading tasks could demonstrate whether phonological and syntactical differences cause the production of BE features and/or SE features.

Several studies (Amos, Rosen and Olson, 1971; Brown, 1968; Jagger and Cullinan, 1975; Rogers, 1976; Rogen and Ames, 1972) have examined the performance of BE primary-aged children on oral reading tasks given in Standard English and have found evidence

of dialect interference. The results of these studies are questionable however, because the subjects in these studies were not screened to assure the readers that they spoke BE and there is much empirical evidence which indicate that all Black people do not speak BE (Carroll and Feigenbaum, 1967; DeStefano, 1973; Dillard, 1972; Labov, 1967).

Other studies which have examined both SE and BE features of primary students are Harber (1977), Lui (1975-76), Simons (1974), Simons and Johnson (1974 and Sims (1972). These studies with the exception of Harber, indicated that there were no major differences in the performance of BE speakers on SE and BE oral reading tasks.

Lui (1975-76) studied the oral reading miscues of 30 second and third grade BE speaking children who had read SE and BE stories in the standard orthography and found no significant differences on oral reading miscues. Lui's study however, has been criticised by Harber (1981) because she had made no provisions for measuring the performance of subjects who were unable to read and it has been suggested by Baratz (1970) that the extent to which linguistic interference is a factor in oral reading performance is probably greater than the research shows because in order to be tested, a child should have attained a level of reading proficiency which precludes nonreaders. It was seen that this would be a factor affecting Liu's data.

Simons (1974) studied, second, third and fourth grade Black children reading real and nonsense Black dialect homophone pairs

for example *bus-bust* and *hus-hust*. It was hypothesized that the first member of each pair would be easier to read than the second member because its spelling is closer to BE phonology. Simons found that in all three grades, there were very little differences between the word types and that the differences favoured more the second type thus refuting the phonological interference hypothesis.

In Simons and Johnson (1974) study of second and third grades, the sentence repetition task was used. The task called for the students to repeat sentences of BE and/or SE to measure the degrees of dialect interference. The researchers found that the children repeatedly code-switched but more from Black dialect to Standard English than vice-versa. In the oral reading task, texts were used that conformed to the features of BE and SE. The results indicated that there were no differences between the SE and BE text measures. The researchers concluded that their data provided no evidence that 2nd and 3rd grade Black dialect speaking children read dialect texts any better than they read the Standard English texts. Their results support the claim that young children are bidialectal and are able to code-switch. Despite their findings however, Simons and Johnson like Lui, made no provisions for measuring the performance of children who were unable to read at the level at which the stories were written and as a result, the subjects who were nonreaders were then eliminated from the studies.

Another limitation that questions the validity and reliability of the studies is that it is uncertain how closely the language of the text matched the speech of the children studied as it was not clarified to what extent the subjects were dialect speakers.

Sims (1976) also reported no evidence of dialect interference in his research. Sims studied 2nd graders who read two stories in each category (SE and BE) and found that the results did not support the contention that speaking a nonstandard dialect interferes with reading. He noted that his subjects shifted to a special style when reading aloud which more closely approximated SE, but that when they were retelling the stories more dialect features were utilized. Sims also noted that the readers made miscues which shifted from one dialect to another so that when they were reading the dialect form they shifted to SE and when reading the SE form BE miscues were made. It was noted that the dialect stories had the highest percentage of miscues. According to Sims, there were no important differences in the reading performance of 2nd graders. Sims' conclusions demonstrate evidence of the bidialectal ability of younger children. Their miscues from one dialect to the other also indicate that some interference does take place in the forms of phonological and syntactical miscues. The weaknesses of Sims' study are that he did not provide sufficient information on how he selected his readers and the levels of difficulties of his stories. Conclusions drawn must therefore be

formed with an awareness of these shortcomings.

In Harber's study on oral reading tasks (1977), she used 90 third grade and 90 fifth grade Black lower socio-economic children from two inner-city schools. She used the Baratz Sentence Imitation Test to determine the degree of bidialectism and consequently formed three groups which were presented with BE translations of the Gray Oral Reading Tests and also the SE forms of those tests. She found that the results of the comparisons indicated that the subjects scored significantly higher on the BE standard orthography form of both tests, than on the SE form with no significant differences among the groups on any of the forms of the oral reading tasks or measures. The first part of Harber's study shows some evidence of interference but the second section questions the former on the non-significant differences in performances among the groups indicating the possibility that the children were still able to read the SE forms of the tests.

Another study that looked at oral reading tasks but that differed from the aforementioned in that it examined the ease of processing Standard and Black English completed sentences, is the 1974 study done by Copple and Suci. These researchers used five and seven year old students, to study grammatical features that differed in SE and BE and the conclusions were based on how quickly the children responded. For example, the children were to respond to the sentence *When Jane is in a hurry she . . .* either with the BE answer *run* or the SE response *runs*. The experimenters found that

the results failed to show that dialect differences created interference with comprehension. It is worth noting that while comprehension was not found to be a problem 42% of the answers were in BE only. This could seem to indicate that grammatical responses typical of BE may not interfere with comprehension of text.

The studies in this section give evidence of the bidialectal ability of the primary-aged child with no major differences in performances (with the exception of Harber's (1977) study) on SE and BE tasks. There being no major differences in performance in the majority of comparative studies indicate that children do not need BE materials to improve their performance in oral reading because they are performing equally as well on SE materials. Their miscues may reflect their dialect but because of code-switching there is no guarantee that the students' knowledge of SE will not interfere in reading BE (and these studies have shown that it does). The studies demonstrate that there is phonological and syntactical renderings of either dialect on BE and/or SE oral reading tasks but that there were no major differences in results. Whether there is an interference in understanding needs to be verified by examining those studies that have focused on reading comprehension.

#### Primary Students and Listening Comprehension Tasks

Listening comprehension tasks test how well students can aurally process language in connected discourse and simultaneously gain meaning. Nonstandard speakers who experience conflicts in



the language of presentation could exhibit interference in their rates of processing meaning and in their production of written or oral language.

Studies which have examined the performance of Black and White primary children on listening comprehension using SE and yielded conflicting results were Hall and Turner (1971; 1972), Hall, Turner and Russell (1973), Osseer, Wang and Zaid (1969), and Peskin (1974). The results of some of these studies must be interpreted with caution however because in some cases all subjects were not screened to assure readers that Black subjects spoke BE and White students spoke SE.

Osseer, Wang and Zaid (1969) was one of the first studies that attempted to assess both comprehension and imitation of the same materials. They compared the performance of middle-class White and lower-class Black preschoolers on an instrument that they developed consisting of 26 sentences representing 13 SE syntactic structures. The subjects' abilities to imitate was assessed by having each one repeat the stimulus sentence. The authors reported more imitation deviations among the Black children than among the White children even when differences between BE and SE were said to have been taken into consideration indicating that interference takes place.

The Osseer et al findings have been criticised because of the differences in class of the children which would have had a more powerful impact of their findings than if the children had

come from similar backgrounds where the environmental differences would not have been so gross. Criticisms have also been directed towards their compilation of data. The comprehension and imitation data were gathered separately which mean that the sentences were presented twice, once for comprehension and once for imitation making it more difficult for readers to determine whether any specific imitation was also used as a basis for comprehension.

Hall and Turner (1971) used the Osser et al instrument to compare the performance of White and Black kindergarten subjects and they failed to find significant differences between the means of the two groups on comprehension scores. When specific deviations mentioned by Osser et al as being characteristic of BE (omission of the possessive 's, omission of the third person singular marker s) were analyzed, Hall and Turner found that the BE speaker made significantly more such deviations than the White students. However, when some of the sentences used by Osser et al converted to BE there was no change in or loss of meaning implying that dialect affects the surface structure or the phonologic and syntactic interpretation of the text but not its meaning.

Hall and Turner subsequently constructed a test which attempted to rectify the limitations of the Osser et al task. They presented the imitation and comprehension tasks simultaneously so that the subject then based his/her comprehension either on the SE presentation of the experimenter or on his/her BE imitation. The test was later used in subsequent studies (Hall and Turner

1972a, 1972b; and Hall, Turner and Russell, 1973). Analysis of the comprehension scores leaned more toward their initial findings. There were no significant differences among any of the first grade groups on comprehension and the researchers concluded that there was little evidence that Black students were at a disadvantage in comprehending SE because they spoke or imitated in BE. Results from their 1972a study also revealed that there was little evidence in favour of dialect being the cause for unique comprehension problems for the BE speaking child.

The Hall and Turner (1972b) study of second and third graders revealed the converse of their previous studies. They found that the BE subjects exhibited less SE on three types of sentences and that the BE speakers scored significantly lower than their White counterparts on comprehending the possessive sentences. This resulted in SE comprehension and imitation scores being lower for the Black than the White subjects hence providing evidence that the BE could possibly interfere with comprehension of SE materials.

Numerous studies have been reported in which equivalent listening comprehension tasks were presented in SE and BE. In some of these studies (Andreacchi, 1973; Foster, 1970; Hooper and Powell, 1971; Jones, 1973; Vokurka, 1975) again all the subjects were not screened to assure readers that all subjects actually spoke BE. All the studies with the exception of Andreacchi's found evidence of interference. Of those studies that screened

their subjects (Balaban, 1976; Matheson, 1974; and Ramsey, 1972) some evidence of interference was found while other such studies (Fins, 1975; Frentz, 1971; and Cagney, 1977) found none. Harber (1977) found evidence for the support of BE materials. Harber's findings also give more support to interference in reading SE materials by BE speakers because her results were not equivalent but significantly higher in reading BE materials than SE.

Overall, the studies in this section are divided on whether Black dialect interferes with listening comprehension in the reading of SE and BE materials. On the comprehension of studies using SE materials exclusively, the data point more to noninterference but in comparative studies of SE and BE materials the findings are conflicting. Therefore at this point in the review, there is no clear answer to the question of interference in listening comprehension. However, the data do seem to indicate that interference takes place at the surface structure level in reading SE and BE materials as some children reconstructed and imitated SE features in BE forms.

#### Primary Students and Silent Reading Tasks

During silent reading, students make use of context clues to facilitate access to meaning. Nonstandard speakers who experience interference at the phonological level should not necessarily experience interference in silent reading tasks if they are skilled users of context clues.

The studies which have examined the performance of Black and/or White children on silent reading comprehension tasks presented in SE only or in both SE and BE and yielded conflicting results are Andreacchi (1973), Hockman (1973), Jagger (1972), Marwit and Neumann (1974), and Nolen (1972). The Andreacchi, Hockman and Nolen studies have been criticised for not screening the students on their speech prior to selecting them.

In other studies on silent reading where the subjects were screened to assure readers that the Black students spoke BE and the White students spoke SE, all the studies gave evidence of the lack of interference of Black English.

In Jagger (1972) and Marwit and Neumann (1974), both Black and White subjects performed better on the SE form of the silent reading task than on the equivalent BE form. Marwit and Neuman indicated though, that their results might have been biased because of the subjects familiarity with SE as the "expected and accepted" language of the classroom as well as their distrust of BE in a setting where BE is rarely used and often unrewarded. If this is indeed the case, then the results of many of the studies are questionable because of the effect of this attitude. However, it can also be argued that if the subjects were experiencing problems in using BE or SE the results would have indicated this according to the reliability of the tasks.

Melmed's (1971) study utilized third grade Black and White children on a variety of tasks. He wanted to test their ability to discriminate auditorily, to produce answers and to comprehend

in both oral and silent reading. He hypothesized that if phonological interference existed then the Black children would do less well on the reading comprehension measures than the White children who exhibited fewer nonstandard dialect features. He concluded that although the Black children differed from the White students on auditory discrimination and production of BE phonological features, the Black children did differ in their ability to comprehend these features in oral and silent reading. Therefore, Melmed does not support the hypothesis of phonological interference in comprehension. Simons (1979) has questioned the representativeness of Melmed's subjects' reading ability and degree of dialect speaking which question his results.

Shields (1979) wanted to ascertain the extent to which the use of certain BE and SE features in a school setting affected oral and silent reading and listening comprehension with primary students. Her data concluded that there were no significant results but she supports the view that the school setting has been found to yield a different kind, amount and style of speech than a secular setting thereby indicating her belief that attitudes toward SE might have affected the students' performance. However, it is worth noting that the confound of attitude can never be totally obliterated and would affect data findings in all studies. Shields' results then indicate that interference may not affect students' reading to a vastly negative extent.

All the studies discussed in the silent reading tasks despite their criticisms, have given data that do not support interference

in comprehension. The results yielded no major differences in comparative studies with SE and BE and often cited superior performance on the SE task. Melmed's (1971) study which covered several skills does lend support to interference at the phonological level of interpretation but not at the comprehension level of reading.

#### Primary Students and Other Studies

Rental and Kennedy (1972) and Rystrom (1970) are two of the only studies that have examined Black dialect and Standard English performance after dialect training had taken place.

Rystrom replicated an earlier study that he had done (Rystrom, 1968) which had been designed to determine if BE was a cause of reading disability. Rystrom (1970) used two experimental groups of Black first graders who were joined and given 25 minutes of daily dialect instruction in SE phonology over a period of eight weeks. While the experimenter was conducting the dialect training, one of the regular teachers provided math enrichment for the other group. Rystrom concluded that at the end of the treatment period, no significant differences were found between groups and that his results indicated that dialect training will not significantly affect the reading achievement scores of BE children. His results confirm the assumption that dialect interferes with reading achievement because the children who were taught SE forms continued to exhibit BE features in their reading.

Kentel and Kennedy (1972) used the same research strategy as Rystrom (1970) (as they both attempted to manipulate the amount of dialect used by the children) and they studied the effects of pattern drill (a method used in second-language teaching) in Standard English on first grade Appalachian dialect speakers. They failed to find differences in reading achievement between groups which according to the researchers failed to support phonological interference. These results along with the conclusions of other dialects of SE studies (Choy and Dodd, 1976; Ciborowski and Choy, 1974) lend support to the noninterference theory of language differences in comprehension.

The studies in this sub-section lend more support to the claim that BE does not adversely affect reading performance or creates an interference when reading and that attempts to deliberately instruct some children in SE to facilitate their reading in SE may not be fruitful.

Thus far the data of all the studies discussed in this section of the paper cumulatively present conflicting views on the question of interference, particularly where it affects comprehension. It seems reasonable to summarize at this time that the bulk of the research show that phonological and syntactical features of BE will be evidenced in certain tasks of reading such as oral reading (although this is not the case in all studies and with all BE speakers). On the question of interference in comprehension tasks, more of the data appear to claim that interference does not greatly affect the processing of meaning. The subject selection of some



experiments also hindered the results and also the establishment of more definite conclusions.

### Primary Children and Testing

To further investigate the question of interference, an examination of studies that have researched the performance of BE speakers on norm and/or criterion referenced tests in reading or reading related areas may further help to clarify areas of interference or noninterference. The preceding subsections have indicated a tendency toward noninterference in comprehension and BE students' performance on reading tests in SE and/or BE materials may help to support or disclaim this bias.

In reviewing the relevant literature pertaining to testing, most of the experiments in SE made allowances for BE miscues or used alternate scoring methods thus enabling the production of more equitable results for BE students.

Arnold and Reed (1976) did a comparative study of Black and White children from kindergarten, 2nd and 4th grades on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Their results indicated that the kindergarten children regardless of race and sex performed similarly but that in the higher grades the Black children of both sexes did significantly poorer than White children. However, when allowances were made for BE responses all the children in each group performed similarly. This would suggest that interference of BE features took place and resulted in BE speakers' miscues. The kindergarten children probably performed equally because the

the tasks did not involve reading.

Hunt (1974) analyzed errors made by 65 inner-city 3rd and 4th graders on the Gray Oral Reading Test. When the errors were counted on scored passages, 46% of the errors were attributed to BE. After the first scoring according to the manual, rescoring took place and the errors attributed to BE were not counted. Results for the total group showed that the mean difference between the two scores was about three points. The amount of errors supports the earlier claim of phonological interference in oral reading.

Nurss (1971) examined the performance of both Black and White, higher and lower socio-economic standing (SES) four-year old urban children on the Brown, Fraser, Bellugi Test of Grammatical Contrasts. When an alternative scoring system was used both the Black and White lower SES Children improved significantly. No significant differences were found for the higher SES children. Nurss introduces the confound of class which could distort the results but still it could be inferred that nonstandard based answers when given equivalent status as SE result in higher scores thus indicating that comprehension is not affected by language differences.

There are three studies which found no differences in testing results when equivalent SE and BE forms were used. Johnson (1974) reported very modest differences between Black and White four-year-olds (who were matched on nonverbal intelligence test scores) on

standardized language tests. Quay (1972, 1974) compared the performance of Black four-year-olds on the Stanford-Binet which was administered in SE and BE. Both studies found no significant differences in test scores on the two forms. It could be deduced that children understood both forms of the tests hence comprehension was not a problem.

Overall, these studies on tests indicate that BE miscues do not hinder comprehension but may affect scoring when allowances are not made for language differences. They also indicate that sometimes children perform comparably on BE and SE materials indicating that BE materials do not necessarily facilitate higher scoring on comprehension. Although the core of these studies in this section used preschoolers who may not have begun instruction in reading, their findings have implications for the question of interference namely that BE miscues indicate language differences but do not hinder comprehension.

#### Secondary Students and Reading

Because older students have more experience with both SE and BE, it can be hypothesized that the possibility of less interference in reading activities exists especially when older students are compared to younger or more inexperienced language users. With this view in mind, the review now examines the performance of secondary students in studies which have been done on the question of interference.

Labov (1970) studied the understanding of the morpheme--  
*ed* by Black adolescents. He had the students read aloud isolated  
sentences like the following:

*When I passed by, I read the posters.*  
*I looked for trouble when I read the news.*

The pronunciation of the word *read* would indicate whether the students understood the *-ed* to be a past tense marker. Labov found that his subjects were able to comprehend the marker 35-55% of the time suggesting that failure to pronounce the *-ed* interfered with comprehension of the sentences only a substantial part of the time. Labov also found that the subjects' performance on this task did not correlate with overall reading skills as measured by a standardized reading test. The lack of correlation between past tense markers and overall reading skills suggests that while some specific features may not be comprehended, they did not interfere with the overall comprehension of connected discourse which is often aided by other syntactic and semantic information through redundant clues such as the word *yesterday* in the sentence *yesterday when I passed by I read the posters*. Labov's study adds support to the accumulating evidence in support of noninterference on comprehension tasks.

Reynolds, Taylor, Steffinson, Shirley and Anderson (1982) investigated cultural schemata with Black and White eighth grade students and its effect on comprehension. Students read a passage in SE that dealt with an instance of *sounding or playing the dozens*, a form of ritual insult predominantly found in the Black community.

Their results indicated that Black students tended to interpret the subject as being about verbal play while the White students comprehended the passage as being about physical aggression. Their findings indicate that comprehension is also affected by the content or subject of the text which could also affect performance. Interference was not a problem in this study as students were familiar with the content and as Labov (1970) indicated other clues given in connected discourse help to facilitate comprehension. Reynolds et al study has special implications for culturally biased materials which are used in the educational field as a means of assessment.

Another study using older students and virtually the only study using a West Indian population, has been done by Edwards (1981) on West Indian dialect speakers in Britain. Edwards used 80 eleven year old West Indian and English students to answer comprehension questions. The answers were then compared and no differences were found between the group of poor readers (reading age 6-9 years) thereby confirming Edwards' view that dialect (Creole) does not interfere with the initial stages of reading acquisition but interferes with the processing of clues in the readers (in this case the older students) who have mastered the mechanical skills of reading. Smolins (1974) who used younger children in her study concurs with Edwards on this point that Creole does not interfere with reading acquisition. Anderson (1979) also supports Edwards on the hypothesis that Creole interferes with processing in more advanced reading.

Edwards noted that the English readers paused only at grammatical junctures while the West Indian readers paused con-

siderably more often at non-grammatical junctures which contributed to lower comprehension scores and which were overall affected by the slowing down of the processing of linguistic features as a result of language. Edwards however, did not indicate if the scores of the West Indians would have been comparable to the English students if allowances had been made for Creole answers which were equivalent in meaning to the SE responses. Her findings suggest that nonstandard language interferes with the process of reading in older students but not necessarily younger students as the younger students processing of features would not be automatic. Edwards' findings however, question the metacognitive theory that older students are more aware of language and are able to facilitate or process acquisition of linguistic features more quickly than their younger peers (Eson and Walmsley 1980).

Bartel and Axelrod (1969) and Ramer and Rees (1973) have also used older students in their studies on interference. Bartel and Axelrod used Black inner-city 9th grade pupils to repeat and read orally a series of sentences randomly drawn from 4th and 8th grade level paragraphs of Forms A, B, C, and D of the Gray Oral Reading Test (Gray 1963). Their results support the view that interference takes place at the surface level of language.

Ramer and Rees administered a modified version of the Berko Test to Black headstart children from the 5th and 8th grades and found that subjects knew and used the morphological rules of BE and SE and that as the children got older an increased use of SE was demonstrated in their writing even though they continued to use

BE orally. These findings question Edwards' results but also lend more support to the contention that dialect speakers code switch which enables them to further process SE features more so than if they did not have access to SE features at all.

A study that covered a wider span in age groupings is the 1973 experiment by Goodman and Burke on the morpheme *-ed* in oral reading tasks. The experimenters used 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th and 10th grades Black and White students and found that no reader was totally consistent in his or her dialect based shifts. Readers who frequently eliminated *-ed* endings sometimes produced them. The experimenters also found that the dialect variations among the subjects were considerable between and within racial groups. They also found that all but one of the subjects with more than 10% dialect miscues were Black but that there were many Black subjects with few or no dialect miscues. Their findings indicate that code switching takes place at all levels and that dialect differences exist within and across class groupings. Their results also indicate that dialect speakers are inconsistent in their use of SE features indicating that interference does take place but the experimenters believe that dialect involved miscues do not interfere with the reading process or the construction of meaning.

### Conclusion

The preceeding review of the literature on the question of interference in BE and/or SE materials points to some very clear directions. Yes, there is a language conflict produced by two different yet similar dialects merging and yes there is interference

or confusion taking place when a child attempts to call words or produce syntactic structures which may not be similar to his own. Having been in the environment where SE features are heard and taught, it could be expected that conflicts will be produced. Does this conflict interfere with reading?

The review of the literature has verified that interference does take place when children read and process SE features and that it also takes place when children read and process BE features. Therefore, in the processing of SE features which is the orthography of most school materials, interference of BE will be evidenced in the production of sound (reflected by speech differences) and in the production of syntactic features (reflected by grammatical differences). These are the phonological and syntactic processing levels of reading which are basic processes yet vital to arrive at meaning.

It is at the point of meaning where the literature diverges because while interference takes place for most BE speakers at the surface level of reading, the answer as to whether it takes place in comprehension is not as clear. The literature reveals a definite tendency towards noninterference in comprehension but this is not firmly established. This perspective is still on tentative grounds as many of the studies have been criticised for methodological weaknesses which could have had some effect on their findings. However, the bulk of the literature does reflect a noninterference bias in comprehension as particularly seen when dialect miscues



are not counted as errors.

These findings on comprehension and the question of interference, while not confirmed offer many implications for educational practice particularly in the field of reading. These and other implications of the entire review will be discussed in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER V

### IMPLICATIONS OF THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature has shown that there is substantial evidence that interference does take place in the processing of phonological features and syntactical structures. The data however, have revealed a slant toward noninterference in comprehension but these results are inconclusive due to methodological problems of many of the studies. These findings have several implications for pedagogical practice and raise several questions for future research in the field. These implications and questions will be presented in the following paragraphs.

#### Implications for Pedagogical Practice: Educational Materials

A number of methods have been proposed to minimize the interference of nonstandard dialect on reading performance. McDavid (1969) and Venezky (1970) have advocated teaching SE prior to beginning reading to eliminate the source of interference. Shuy (1969, 1970) and Wolfram (1970) have proposed texts that neutralize dialect differences so that features which might predictably be problematic for the nonstandard speaker or not realized in his/her grammar (for example third singular verb inflections) would be eliminated. Another proposal has been the creation and implementation of reading texts that incor-

porate nonstandard features followed by a transistion to the use of the traditional reading materials (Baratz, 1969a; 1969b; 1970b; Fasold, 1971; Johnson, 1971; Stewart, 1969; Wolfram and Fasold, 1969).

The review of the literature has not shown that using any of the preceding materials which purport to minimize the interference on reading performance for nonstandard Black children is more successful than the traditional Standard English instructional materials. It has been verified that most nonstandard Black speakers are bidialectal and capable of acquiring reading skills in SE and it has also been shown that in many comparative studies, the children performed similarly on equivalent SE and BE tasks (Frentz, 1971; Hockman, 1973; Nolen, 1972). Educators therefore need to re-examine the issues of materials selection for nonstandard speakers before making any large-scale implementation which might not be beneficial to their students in the final analysis.

Educators would also need to be cognizant of all issues surrounding the selection of materials for nonstandard speakers because parents would need to be convinced that what is being done is in the best interest of the child. Thus far, the idea of using nonstandard materials has met with a great deal of controversy by parents (Cazden, 1981; Dale, 1972; Erickson, 1969; Mitchell-Kernan, 1972; Schneider, 1971).

There are also many problems to be overcome prior to the possible implementation of nonstandard materials. Writers and educators would have to come to a consensus on which aspects and features of

the language to include in the text and later decide which speakers exhibit those features to warrant the use of the materials. The difficulty here, would lie in the fact that there is considerable range in the amount of features used from speaker to speaker and assessment and evaluation of this could prove to be very controversial. The use of standard materials would therefore create less contention and negativism.

Some researchers (Douglas, 1973; and Goodman, 1969) have suggested that dialect renderings of extant materials be accepted because it is their view that no special materials need to be constructed since children would be permitted and encouraged to read the way they spoke. This suggestion would be advantageous for all concerned as attempts to eradicate nonstandard dialect would be met with failure and the exclusive use of specially made nonstandard materials could be met with opposition and may not prove more beneficial in acquiring reading than the use of extant materials. The literature review has also shown that some students using SE materials did not exhibit language interference in reading (Hall and Turner, 1972a; Hall, Turner and Russell, 1973). The literature has shown too, that studies using comparable SE and BE tasks did not demonstrate higher scores on the BE tasks but equivalent scores on SE and BE tasks and sometimes even higher scores on the SE tasks (Coppie, 1974; Frentz, 1971; Hockman, 1973; Lui, 1975-1976; Nolen, 1972). These studies help to validate the claim that BE speakers can use SE materials in the school systems, and that the use of BE materials will not necessarily facilitate reading acquisition any faster than SE materials.

Educators should also make every attempt to maximize the bidialectal ability of nonstandard speakers through the encouragement and use of both extant and supplementary nonstandard materials as the literature has reflected the bidialectal ability of most nonstandard speakers. This would help to accommodate the language of the nonstandard speaking child and promote code-switching skills so that when and where appropriate a nonstandard speaker would be able to confidently and easily process the language of his/her choice.

Overall, regardless of the text being used, care should be made to reflect the culture of the child so that basic structural differences would be overcome by the context of the text and comparison would therefore be facilitated. Ramphael (1983) has noted that from studies done in the classrooms, ten of the fourteen reading selections used by English as a second dialect (ESD) teachers were unfamiliar to students and contributed to making reading more difficult for the students.

The review therefore points to the use of extant SE materials but does not preclude the use of supplementary BE materials to develop and encourage the bidialectal ability of the students and also positive feelings toward their language and culture.

#### Teacher Training and Inservice

Shuy (1970) has noted that teachers have many misconceptions about the grammar and pronunciation of nonstandard speakers. He and other linguists have emphasized the need for the inclusion of orientation courses on language varieties in teacher preparation and inservice programmes to counter the inclination to form negative

expectations of learners as a result of languages differences (Cannon, 1973; Shuy, 1970; Troike, 1976).

Teachers need to know that all language are equal and that language differences are not signs of inferiority or deficiencies but that because interference will take place for some speakers, knowledge of phonological, structural and semantic differences will increase their understanding of the students' miscues. Teacher training and inservice will also familiarize teachers with the equivalent and nonequivalent aspects of NSE and SE and foster acceptance of language differences in the classroom.

Teachers also need to be aware of the close relationship between language and socio-economic status and the factors surrounding and affecting this association. Venezky (1981) has noted that in 1980 nonstandard language students came primarily from disadvantaged homes and Craig (1976) has stated that most Creole speakers are within the levels of lower-working, working and lower-middle classes. The implication of this association may negatively influence teacher expectation and consequently the performance of the child.

Teachers therefore need to become more perceptive about their attitudes toward language varieties and working-class students and the possible repercussions and stereotypic associations that could exist because of them. There is considerable evidence to suggest that speakers of nonstandard English dialects in general are evaluated as inferior to speakers of SE by their teachers

(Harber, 1981) and teacher training and inservice sessions might help to rectify some of the negative associations attributed to such speakers and consequently eliminate some of the educational problems confronting them.

### Classroom Practice

The review of the literature has implications for the strategies employed by teachers to facilitate reading and language skills for nonstandard speakers.

Firstly, teachers need to establish an atmosphere for the encouragement of language exchange and development in their classrooms which would facilitate confidence in the use of the vernacular. Activities such as the sharing of experiences through studying and listening to stories would help to establish such a foundation. Wells (in press) suggests that children who listen to stories and tell stories discover that language has symbolic power and would be able to reenact those stories in their dramatic play, writing and reading and at the same time motivate their imaginations, encourage conversation and attention to words. From such a setting teachers could create a basis for language expression in reading.

This type of environment would also help to facilitate the acceptance of dialect renderings in reading activities as miscues and not as errors. The review of the literature suggests that in studies where dialect renderings were accepted, the students' performance was comparable to their SE counterparts (Arnold, 1976; Hunt, 1974). Cunningham (1976-1977) investigated whether teachers'

attitudes toward miscues which did not change content meaning differed for miscues which were not due to dialect and found that the teachers corrected 78% of the Black-dialect specific miscues and 27% of the non-dialect specific miscues implying that teachers need help in establishing meaning equivalence between SE and BE features. Such help would be given to teachers in workshop sessions and through classroom practice in trying to interpret the miscues. Goodman (1972) suggests that the experiential background of the child is revealed through his/her miscues. Therefore, there is a need for teachers to develop strategies, to list and study the miscues that nonstandard speakers make so that they would understand and interpret them and also distinguish those miscues that reflect language differences from those "errors" which reflect reading difficulty.

Goodman (1972) and Ramphael (1983) also caution teachers against "correcting" dialect while a child reads because it confuses and interferes with comprehension and the development of reading proficiency. Teachers therefore need to be familiar with their correction strategies and perceptive of when the reader needs help in establishing meaning.

Teachers also need to develop strategies to promote metacognition and thus help to facilitate the speed of obtaining meaning. Metacognitive strategies would help the child to be more perceptive of language differences and develop means of storing and retrieving required features and structures when desired.



There are also implications for instructional methods in teaching nonstandard children how to read. Because of language differences and phonological and structure interference, such students would need an eclectic approach to teaching reading that has a language experience background. Such a method would promote attention to the children's experiences and language and foster the development of reading skills in contexts familiar to the children.

There are implications for English as a Second Dialect classes (ESD) or the "special" classes that are held for nonstandard English speakers in the United States, Canada and England. Edwards (1981) has indicated that on a national level, there were proportionately four times as many West Indian children in Educationally Sub-Normal (ESN) classes in London, England as there were indigenous children and that assessment was based on language differences. Townsend (1972) also concurs with Edwards that many immigrant pupils in London are placed with less able pupils because of language. Because the children's language is different does not necessitate their being placed in special classes to "improve" their language. The bidialectal ability of nonstandard students has been emphasized and children who are not experiencing developmental lags or deficits in their nonstandard language development should not be placed in ESN or ESD/L classes to improve their reading or language ability.

### Assessment and Evaluation

The implications for testing are closely related to those of classroom practice. Educators and those responsible for developing assessment norms and procedures need to accommodate the language differences of nonstandard speakers by allowing acceptance of dialect miscues and creating culture-free texts. For the Caribbean territory this is particularly crucial especially in those cases where students are expected to perform well on tests created by the United Kingdom for their culture. There is also a need to distinguish and differentiate those tests which are calling for proficiency in written SE (for example English) and those that are calling for cognition and understanding of a content subject (for example History).

Thus, in oral tests, phonological differences should be accepted and similarly in other areas. In this way nonstandard speakers would be given a fair chance in assessment and not experience any loss of opportunity because of language differences.

### Implications for Future Research

The literature has shown that many of the studies experienced methodological problems in selection of BE speakers (Hall and Turner, 1972a; Hockman, 1973; Nolen, 1972; Osser, Wang and Zaid, 1969; Rosen and Ames, 1972). This shortcoming of the studies needs to be rectified in future research so that more conclusive findings would result. A possible alternative would be to study the reliability of the Sentence Repetition Task developed by

Menyuk (1971) and later expanded by Anastasion and Hanes (1976) as a measurement of nonstandard speech.

The reading materials used in the compilation of data also need to be scrutinized in subsequent research so that subjects would not be eliminated because they are unable to read. Harber (1981) has suggested that to overcome this limitation, subjects should be allowed to read progressively difficult passages which would facilitate the inclusion of all subjects.

The definition of interference needs to be stated and clarified so that readers would know which level of interference was being discussed such as phonological, syntactical, semantic or combined levels. This would help to clarify the focus of the investigation.

The review also revealed that the majority of the studies utilized primary students while there was a paucity of studies done with high school students. Due to developmental differences in the language and cognition of mature students, further research needs to be done to verify that language differences do or do not create interference in the processing of mature students' language. Edwards (1981) has claimed that interference is greater in older students whose reading have become automatic. Further studies need to be done to validate such a claim.

Studies need to be done to investigate the possible causes of reading failure in older nonstandard students. Generally, the role of language interference in the reading of older students

has not been thoroughly investigated and is an area for future research.

The bidialectal skills of all nonstandard students also need to be further documented particularly the differences and/or similarities that exist across grades, within grade groupings, and across and within differing and similar SES groups. This ability is said to go through some changes as older students begin to accept or reject SE in favour of their indigenous language and culture. This area needs further investigation.

The area of comprehension needs to be further studied to validate the claim that language differences do not interfere with the processing of meaning.

Comprehension tasks need to be more clearly defined and examined on the factual, inferential and critical levels of interpretation. Comprehension tasks that rely upon reading passages also need to be further studied rather than areas that do not call for the visual processing of information such as listening comprehension. Generally, there is a need for indepth studies in comprehension processes and the acquisition of meaning in all speakers.

Beyond the actual examination of the processes and related tasks of reading, investigations need to be done in the classroom interaction of nonstandard students with other pupils and teachers and the nature of the discourse used in the classroom by teachers and students in the processing of information and their effects on the performance of the students. Strategies used by teachers of successful and unsuccessful nonstandard students also need to be documented and examined.

For the Caribbean territory, there is an acute shortage of reliable studies in Creole interference and while conclusions may be drawn from the BE setting, the differences in semantics and syntax are in some cases extreme enough to warrant further investigation. Areas where there is a distinctive Creole variety of English (for example, Jamaica, Guyana, and Trinidad) indepth studies need to be done to examine the degree of interference in reading particular for these students who may not be bidialectal.

Emerging from the entire review are several questions that need to be theoretically and empirically analyzed. These questions point the way to future research areas and are as follows:

1. What role does language differences play in the comprehension of text?
2. Does bidialectism increase or decrease interference in the reading of nonstandard speakers?
3. How does bidialectism develop? What factors promote its acceptance and/or rejection in nonstandard speakers?
4. Do miscues facilitate or interfere in the processes of reading?
5. What teaching strategies are most appropriate for decreasing the degree of interference in the reading of nonstandard speakers?

### Conclusions

Research on the question of interference is still in its beginning stages and it is felt by many that thus far very little research has been done and for the most part has been inconclusive (Dillard, 1978; Rystrom, 1970; Somervill, 1975; Venezky, 1981). Therefore, until further studies are done the role of

language differences in reading will remain debatable.

Emerging from this study are several basic assumptions which have been formulated from the combined review of the literature and the theoretical background. The review of the literature will conclude with these assumptions which sum up all the conclusions and areas of further research as presented in this chapter.

The first assumption recognizes the relationship between oral language and reading but that this relationship is not necessarily a causal one as there are many other operational factors such as cognition, perception, intelligence, and socio-economic factors affecting students' performances in reading.

Another assumption is based on the belief that attempts to change a child's language is psychologically unhealthy and also ignores the powerful influences of home and culture. Associated with this is the belief that one's language does not need to change because all dialects are capable of processing any level of cognitive thought and skills. However, nonstandard working-class speakers do need to have access to standard speech patterns so that such forms can be utilized when and where appropriate (for example in school) and thus facilitate upward mobility in society if desired. Thus bidialectism should be encouraged in nonstandard speakers and their development of code-switching examined.

A child will therefore experience interference in his/her processing of language but once the child has processed

the text into his or her own language patterns comprehension should be facilitated. Teachers therefore need to be cognizant and perceptive of language variations and accept miscues as tokens of understanding. Similarly, researchers need to investigate the miscues that nonstandard speakers make at all levels of schooling and draw conclusions on the effect of miscues on comprehension through across-grade and within-class analyses.

A final assumption is based on the use of SE texts. The language of the text-books is different from the speech of most students (standard speakers included) and hence most students experience some problems in adjusting to the styles of some reading textbooks. The speech of the nonstandard speakers though more variant from SE is not so vastly different that it calls for special text books to facilitate reading. In those cases of extreme differences (Creole) further studies need to be done to investigate the impact of interference.

Many of these assumptions need to be further investigated and research needs to address itself to more longitudinal and ethnographic studies involving multiple data collection so that some attempts can be made to understand the process of reading and the specific problems that nonstandard speakers face in attaining reading power.

### Concluding Remarks

Speaking a nonstandard dialect does not in and of itself interfere with learning to read SE (Gumperz, 1970; Sims, 1982; Smith, 1978; Smitherman, 1980; Somervill, 1975; Troutman and Falk, 1982) because there is no one cause for reading failure in students (Hunt, 1974-1975; Robinson, 1946).

This paper has attempted to single out one factor affecting reading performance but even though there is an effect, the extent of the effect is virtually difficult to estimate because of the conglomeration of other variables that need to be taken into consideration. Deutch (1964) has gone so far as to say that it is clear that disadvantaged children (Black dialect speakers) are likely to suffer from virtually every problem imaginable by the fact that many of them are poor.

The relationship of social stratification and its correlates to nonstandard speakers cannot be ignored and have consequences for reading (Entwisle, 1979). Such confounds as health care, size of home and family, household amenities and number of books. all affect the scholastic performance of children. Other home factors such as quality of language interaction, familial attitudes and motivation also come to bear on how well some children perform in school.

Beyond the home are the school related variables such as quality of education, availability of materials, teacher attitudes, teaching methods and styles, which all bear on learning situations for children.



Outside of the school are also the cultural conflicts that affect the education of some children. Labov and Robbins (1969-70) have suggested that cultural conflicts is strong in reading failure of urban ghetto Black children as the influence of cultural norms may be opposed to the norms of the school and society. For some Black children this conflict may be evidenced in the language of the streets or culture and the language of the school and a failure to compromise or accommodate both cultures.

Peer pressure is also another factor affecting the performance of some school children. Figurel (1970) has noted that one of the major conclusions of the Coleman Report (1966) was that the associates of school children was one of the most important factors affecting students' intellectual achievement.

The previously mentioned variables and the factors of personality and self-concept are important determinants of one's behavior. They all play a role in deciding how one performs.

In concluding, it is important for researchers and educators to be aware of the interaction of all the variables that play a part in determining the students' failings and successes in school. The magnitude and scope of these factors, affect the compilation and analyses of data and ultimately man's understanding of various phenomena. Rather than deter us in our quest for answers and solutions, attempts to unravel the factors must be continued. Only through the microscopic analyses of factors and the unification

of their correlates can experimenters arrive at a consensus for the well-being of all mankind.

This study on dialect interference in reading, is only a 'tip of the iceberg' and hopefully will go much further into the domain of language and reading in subsequent studies.

## REFERENCES

### A:

- Abromova, S. U. (1979). Ideological, doctrinal, philosophical, religious and political aspects of the African slave trade. In Unesco, The African slave trade from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century (pp. 16-30). Paris, France: Unesco.
- Adler, Mark. (1977). Pidgins, creoles and lingua francas: A sociolinguistic study. Hamburg: Helmet Buske Verlag.
- Alatis, James E. (1973). Teaching standard English as a second language or dialect: The unanswered questions, the successes and the promises. In Robert Fox (Ed.), Essays on teaching English as a second language and as a second dialect (pp. 43-56). Urbana, Il. : National Council of Teachers of English.
- Alexander, C. (1980). Black English dialect and the classroom teacher. The Reading Teacher, 33, 571-577.
- Allen, P. David. (1972). What teachers of reading should know about the writing system. In Richard E. Hodges and E. Hugh Rudorf (Eds.), Language and learning to read. What teachers should know about language. (p. 87). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Allen, P. David. (Ed.). (1976). Findings of research in miscue analysis: Classroom implications. Urbana, Illinois: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills National Council of Teachers of English.
- Allen, Virginia. (1973). Some strategies for teaching standard English as a second dialect. In Robert Fox (Ed.), Essays on teaching English as a second language and as a second dialect (pp. 92-101). Urbana, Il. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Alleyne, Mervyn C. (1976, January). Dimensions and varieties of West Indian English and the implications for teaching. In Vincent D'Oyley (Ed.), Black students in urban Canada, T.E.S.L. Talk, I, 35-62.

- Ames, Wilbur S., Rosen, Carl L., Olson, Arthur V. (1971). The effects of nonstandard dialect in the oral reading behavior of fourth grade Black children. In Carl Braun (Ed.), Language, reading and the communication process. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Anastasiow, Nicholas J., Hanes, Michael L. (1976). Language patterns of poverty children. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.
- Anastasiow, Nicholas J., Janes, Madlyn Levine, Hanes, Michael, L. (1982). Language and reading strategies for poverty children. Baltimore, Maryland: University Park Press.
- Anastasiow, Nicholas. (1971). Oral language: Expression of thought. Newark, Delaware: The International Reading Association.
- Anderson, D. F. Rosenthal, R. (1968). Some effects of interpersonal expectancy and social interaction on institutionalized retarded children. Proceedings of the 76th. Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 3, 479-480.
- Anderson, Wolseley, W. Grant, Rudolph W. (1975, April). The new newcomers. Toronto, Ontario: York University.
- Anglin, J. (1970). The growth of word meaning. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Andreacchi, J. (1973). Listening comprehension and reading comprehension of Negro dialect speakers in Negro dialect and in standard English. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 2417A. (University Microfilms No. 73-25, 153).
- Arnold, Karen & Reed, Lauren. (1976, November). The grammatic closure subtest of the ITPA: A comprehensive study of Black and White children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 41, 477-485.
- Atkinson, Martin, (1983). Explanations in the study of child language development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ausubel, David P. (1964). Adults vs. children in second-language learning: Psychological considerations. Modern Language Journal, 48, 421-425.
- B:
- Bailey, Beryl Loftman. (1966). Jamaican creole syntax: A transformational approach. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

- Bailey, Beryl Loftman. (1970). Some arguments against the use of dialect readers in the teaching of initial reading. Florida FL Reporter, 8, 47.
- Bailey, Beryl Loftman. (1973). Some principles of bilingual and bidialectal education. In Robert Fox (Ed.), Essays on teaching English as a second language and as a second dialect (pp. 107-174). Urbana, IL; National Council of Teachers of English.
- Balaban, M. J. (1976). Performance of Black and White children on a Black dialect and standard English receptive syntax screening test. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 6595A-6596A. (University Microfilms No. 76-7768).
- Baldwin, James. (181). If Black English isn't a language, then tell me, what is? In Geneva Smitherman (Ed.), Black English and the education of Black children and youth. (pp. 390-392). Detroit: Wayne State University.
- Bartlett, Elsa Jaffe. (1981). Selecting preschool language programs. In Courtney B. Cazden (Ed.), Language in early childhood education (pp. 37-76). Washington, D. C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Banks, James A., & Grambs, Jean D. (Eds.). (1972). Black self-concept: Implications for education and social science. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Baratz, Joan C. (1969, December). A bidialectal task for determining language proficiency in economically disadvantaged Negro children. Child Development, 40, 889-901.
- Baratz, Joan. (1970). Educational considerations for teaching standard English to Negro Children. In Roger W. Shuy (Ed.). Teaching standard English in the inner-city. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Baratz, Joan C. (1970). Teaching reading in an urban Negro school system. In Frederick Williams (Ed.), Language and poverty: Perspectives on a theme (pp. 11-24). Chicago: Rand McNally Co.
- Baratz, Joan C., & Shuy, Roger W. (1969). Teaching Black children to read. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Baratz, Stephen S., & Baratz, Joan C. (1970). Early childhood intervention: The social science base of institutional racism. Harvard Educational Review, 40, 29-50.

- Barr, Rebecca C. (1972). Perceptual development in the reading process. In Richard E. Hodges & E. Hugh Rudolf (Eds.), Language and Learning to read: What teachers should know. (pp. 131-139). New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Bartel, N. R., & Axelrod, Judith. (1973, May). Nonstandard English usage and reading ability in Black junior high students. Exceptional Children, 39, 653-655.
- Bartel, N. R., Grill, J. J., & Bryen, D. N. (1973). Language characteristics of Black children: Implications for assessment. Journal of School Psychology, 11, 351-364.
- Bereiter, C., & Engelmann, S. (1966). Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Bereiter, C. and Engelmann, S. (1968). Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bernstein, B. (1969). Social Structures, language and learning. Educational Research, 163-176.
- Bever, T. (1970a). The integrated study of language behaviour. In J. Morton (Ed.), Biological and social factors in psycholinguistic. (pp. 158-209). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Bond, Guy L., & Dykstra, Robert. (1967). The cooperation research program in first grade reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 2, 1-142.
- Black, M. H. (1965). Characteristics of the culturally disadvantaged child. Reading Teacher, 18, 465-470.
- Blodgett, E. G., & Cooper, E. B. (1973). Attitudes of elementary teachers toward Black dialect. Journal of Communication Disorders, 6, 121-133.
- Brown, R., & Hanlon, C. (1970). Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech. In J. R. Hayes (Ed.), Cognition and the development of language. New York: Wiley.
- Brown, V. L. (1968). Language pattern interference in oral reading of selected urban Negro first graders. Dissertation Abstracts International, 29, 1817A. (University Microfilms No. 68-17, 362).
- Bryen, D. N. (1982). Inquiries into child language. Boston: Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Bryen, D. N. (1976, January). Speech--sound discrimination ability on linguistically unbiased tests. Exceptional Children, 42, 195-201.

C:

Cagney, Margaret A. (1977, March). Children's ability to understand standard English and Black dialect. Reading Teacher, 30, 607-610.

Calfee, Robert C., and Drum, Priscilla A. (Eds.). (1978). Teaching reading in compensatory classes. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.

Cancino, H., Rosansky, E. J., & Schumann, J. H. (1974). Testing hypothesis about second language acquisition: The copula and the negative in three subjects. Working Papers in Bilingualism. 3, 80-96.

Cancino, H., Rosanky, E. J. & Schumann, J. H., (1975). The acquisition of the English auxiliary by native Spanish speakers. TESOL Quarterly. 9, 421-430.

Carrington, L. D. (1975). Dialect of a language and other extracts. In The language Arts syllabus 1975-comment and counter-comment. Trinidad and Tobago: School of Education, University of the West Indies.

Carrington, L. D. (1976). Determining Language education policy in Caribbean Sociolinguistic complexes. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 8, 27-44.

Carroll, John B. (1970). The nature of the reading process. In Doris V. Gunderson (Compiler), Language and reading: An interdisciplinary approach (pp. 26-36). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Carroll, W. S., & Feigenbaum, I. (1967). Teaching a second dialect and some implications for TESOL. TESOL Quarterly, 1, 31-40.

Cattell, J. M. (1886). The time taken up by cerebral operations. Mind, 11, 220-242, 377-387, 524-538.

Cazden, Courtney B. (Ed.). (1972). Language in early childhood education. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Cazden, Courtney B. (Ed.). (1981). Language in early childhood education. Washington, D. C.: The National Association for the Education of Young Children.

- Cazden, Courtney B., Bryant, Betty H., & Tillman, Melissa, A. (1981). Making it and going home: The attitudes of Black people toward language education. In C. Cazden (Ed.), Language in early childhood education (pp. 97-106). Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Chall, Jeanne S. (1983). Stages of reading development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Chapman, John L., & Czerniewska, Pam, (Eds.). (1978). Reading from process to practice. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of Syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press.
- Choy, S. I., & Dodd, D. H. (1976). Standard English speaking and nonstandard English-speaking children: Comprehension of both dialects and teacher evaluations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 184-193.
- Ciborowski, T., & Choy, S. I. (1974). Nonstandard English and free recall: An exploratory study. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 5, 271-281.
- Claiborn, W. L. (1969). Expectancy in the classroom: A failure to replicate. Journal of Educational Psychology, 60, 377-383.
- Clarke, Desmond C. (1980). Reading curriculum and instruction in a creole language context. Caribbean Journal of Education, 7, (3), 155-168.
- Clark, E. (1973a). What's in a word. In T. Moore (Ed.), Cognitive development and the acquisition of language (pp. 65-100). New York: Academic Press.
- Cohen, S. Alan, & Kornfeld, Gita. (1970, October). Oral vocabulary and beginning reading in disadvantaged Black children. Reading Teacher, 24, 33-38.
- Coleman, James et al., (1966). Equality of educational opportunity Washington: Office of Education. No. #16.
- Copple, Carol E., and Suci, George J. (1974, December). The comparative ease of processing standard English and Black nonstandard English by lower-class Black children. Child Development, 45, 1048-1053.



- Craig, Dennis R. (1976). Bidialectal education. In Jack Berry (Ed.), Language and education. The Third World International Journal of the Sociology of Language (pp. 93-134). The Hague, Paris: Mouton & Co.
- Cruttenden, A. (1979). Language in infancy and childhood. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Cummins, Jim. (1981). Biliteracy, language proficiency and educational programmes. In John Edwards (Ed.), The Social psychology of reading, Language and Literacy, An Interdisciplinary Monograph Series for Professionals (pp. 131-146). Silver Springs, Maryland, Institute of Modern Language, Inc.
- Cunningham, Patricia M. (1977, Summer). Teachers' Correction responses to Black dialect miscues which are non-meaning changing. Reading Research Quarterly, 12, 637-653.
- D:
- Dale, Philip S. (1972). Language development. Hinsdale, Il.: Dryden Press.
- Davies, Ian (Ed.). (1982). Language and learning in home and school. London, England: Heineman Educational Books.
- DeStephano, Johanna S. (Ed.). (1973). Language, society and education: A profile of Black English. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Deutsch, M. (1963). The disadvantaged child and the learning process. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Education in depressed areas. New York: Teachers' College Press.
- Deutsch, M. (1966). Facilitating development in the pre-school child: Social and psychological perspectives. In F. M. Hechinger (Ed.), Pre-school education today (pp. 73-94). Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co.
- Deutsch, M. & Associates. (1967). The disadvantaged child. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Dillard, J. L. (1972). Black English: It's history and usage in the United States. New York: Random House.
- Dillard, J. L. (1978). Bidialectal education: Black English and standard English in the U.S. In B. Spolsky and R. L. Cooper (Eds.), Case studies in bilingual education. Rowley Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

- Dittmar, Norbert. (1976). Sociolinguistics: A critical survey of theory and application. Great Britain: Edward Arnold Ltd.
- E:
- Edwards, John R. (1979). Language and disadvantage. London, England: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Edwards, John. (Ed.). (1981). The social psychology of reading: Language and literacy. An Interdisciplinary Monograph Series for Professionals. Silver Springs, Maryland: Institute of Modern Languages Inc.
- Edwards, Viv. (1978). Effects of dialect on the comprehension of West Indian children. Educational Research, 30, (1), 51-58.
- Edwards, Viv. (1979). The West Indian language issue in British schools. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Edwards, Viv. (1981). Dialect and reading: A case study of West Indian children in Britain. In John Edwards (Ed.), The social psychology of reading: Language and reading. An interdisciplinary Monograph Series for Professionals (pp. 207-216). Silver Springs, Maryland, Institute for Modern Languages Inc.
- Ekwall, Eldon. (1973). Psychological factors in the teaching of reading. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- Englemann, S. (1970). How to construct effective language programs for the poverty child. In F. Williams (Ed.), Language and poverty. Chicago: Markham.
- Entwisle, Doris R. (1970). Semantic systems of children: Some assessment of social class and ethnic differences. In Frederick Williams (Ed.), Language and poverty: Perspectives on a theme (pp. 123-139). Chicago: Rand McNally Co.
- Entwisle, Doris R. (1979). The child's social environment and learning to read. In T. G. Waller and G. E. Mackinnon (Eds.), Reading research: Advances in theory and practice (Vol. 1), (pp. 145-169). New York: Academic Press.
- Eson, Morris E., & Walmsley, Sean A. (1980). Promoting cognitive and psycholinguistic development. In M. Johnson (Ed.), Toward adolescence: The middle school years. (pp. 204-266). Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press.

Erwin-Tripp, S. M. (1973). Children's Sociolinguistic competence and dialect diversity. In Ervin Flaxman (Ed.), Educating the disadvantaged (pp. 143-172). New York, N.Y.: AMS Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1974). Is second language learning like the first? TESOL Quarterly, 8, 111-127.

F:

Fantini, Mario, & Weinstein, Gerald. (1968). The disadvantaged child: Challenges to education. New York: Harper & Row.

Farr, Beverly P. (1972). Oral language competence and learning to read. In William E. Blanton and J. Jaap Juinman (Eds.), Viewpoints Bulletin of the School of Education Indiana University (pp. 40-49). Bloomington, Indiana: School of Education Indiana University.

Fasold, Ralph W. (1969). Orthography in reading materials for Black English speaking children. In Joan C. Baratz, and Roger W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Black children to read (pp. 68-91). Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Fasold, Ralph W., & Shuy, Roger W. (Eds.). (1970). Teaching Standard English in the inner-city. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Fasold, Ralph, & Wolfram, Walt. (1970). Some linguistic features of Negro dialect. In Ralph W. Fasold & Roger Shuy. (Eds.), Teaching standard English in the inner-city (pp. 41-86): Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Feigenbaum, Irvin. (1970). The use of nonstandard English in teaching. In Ralph W. Fasold and Roger W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching standard English in the Inner City (pp. 87-104). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Figurel, Allen J. (Ed.). (1970). Reading goals for the disadvantaged. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Fries, Charles C. (1963). Linguistics and reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Fry, E. (1972). Reading instruction for classroom and clinic. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fox, Robert. (Ed.). (1973). Essay on teaching English as a second language and as a second dialect. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

G:

Galicia, Jacob Ornstein. (1950). Black English--New Role in the classroom. Curriculum Review, 19, 204-209.

Galicia, Jacob Ornstein. (1980). Black English--New role in the classroom. Curriculum Review, 19, 204-209.

Gay, Judy & Tweney, Rydan D. (1976, May). Comprehension and production of standard and Black English by lower-class Black children. Developmental Psychology, 12, 262-268.

Genshaft, Judy L., & Hirt, Michael. (1974, May). Language differences between Black children and White children. Developmental Psychology, 10, 451-456.

Gleason, Jean Berko. (1981). The teacher's role in helping young children develop language competence. In Courtney B. Cazden (Ed.), Language in early childhood education (rev. ed.), (pp. 83-96). Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Goodman, Kenneth, S. (1965, December). Dialect barriers to reading comprehension. Elementary English, 42, 853-860.

Goodman, Kenneth S. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. Journal of the Reading Specialist, 6, 126-135.

Goodman, Kenneth. (Ed.). (1968). The psycholinguistic nature of the reading process. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Goodman, Kenneth. (1970, Summer). A response to dialect and reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 4, 600-603.

Goodman, Kenneth. (1970, Summer). Dialect rejection and reading: A response. Reading Research Quarterly, 5, (4), 600-603.

Goodman, Kenneth, S. (1972). The reading process: Theory and practice. In Richard E. Hodges and E. Hugh Rudorf (Eds.), Language and learning to read: What teachers should know about language (pp. 143-159). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

- Goodman, Kenneth. (1973). Comprehension-centred reading. In Eldon E. Ekwall (Compiler), Sociological factors in the teaching of reading (pp. 292-302). Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- Goodman, Kenneth & Buck, Catherine. (1973, October). Dialect barriers to reading comprehension revisited. Reading Teacher, 27 (1), 6-12.
- Goodman, Kenneth S., and Goodman, Yetta M. (1978, August). Reading of American children whose language is a stable rural dialect of English or a language other than English (Project NIE-C-00-3-0087), (Final Report). U.S. Dept. of HEW.
- Goodman, Yetta M. (1972). Qualitative reading miscues: Analysis for teacher training. In Richard E. Hodges and E. Hugh Rudolf (Eds.), Language and learning to read; What teachers should know about language (pp. 160-165). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Goodman, Yetta and Simms, Rudine. (1974). Whose dialect for beginning readers? Elementary English, 51 (6), 837-844.
- Gough, P. B. (1976). One second of reading. In H. Singer and R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), Theoretical models and processing of reading. Newark DE: International Reading Association.
- Gray, W. S. (1963). Gray oral reading tests. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Grill, J. Jeffrey, & Bartel, Nettie R. (1977, April). Language bias in tests: ITPA grammatic closure. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 4, 229-235.
- Gumperez, J. J. (1976). Language communication and public negotiation. In P. Sandoz (Ed.), Anthropology and the public interest: Fieldwork and theory. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J. J., & Hernandez, C. (1972). Bilingualism--bidialectism and classroom interaction. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, & D. Hymes (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gunderson, Doris V. (1970). Language and reading: An interdisciplinary approach. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

H:

- Hakula, K. (1975). Learning to speak a second language: What exactly does the child learn? In D. P. Data (Ed.), Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Hall, V., & Turner, K. (1971). Comparison of imitation and comprehension scores between two lower-class groups and the effects of two warm-up conditions on imitation of the same groups. Child Development, 4, 1735-1750.
- Hall, V., & Turner, R. (1972a). The effects of school environments on minority dialect. Unpublished final report to the National Program in Early Childhood Education.
- Hall, V., & Turner, R. (1972b). The influence of speaking Negro nonstandard English on the abilities to imitate and comprehend standard English. Review and recommendations. Final report submitted to the National Program in Early Childhood Education.
- Hall, V., & Turner, R. (1974). The validity of the different language explanation for poor scholastic performance by Black students. Review of Educational Research, 44, 69-81.
- Hall, V., Turner, R., & Russell, W. (1973). The ability of children from four subcultures and two grade levels to imitate and comprehend crucial aspects of standard English: A test of the different language explanation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 64, 947-964.
- Hall, W., & Freedle, R. (1973). Towards the identification of cognitive operations in standard and nonstandard English usage. Paper presented at NIMH conference on Cognitive and Language Development of the Black Child, New Orleans.
- Harber, J. R. (1977). Effects of abstract learning ability and bidialectism on reading tasks presented in English, Black English standard and nonstandard orthographies. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Conference.
- Harber, J. R. (1977, Summer). Influence of presentation dialect and orthographic form on reading performance of Black inner-city children. Educational Research Quarterly, 2, 9-16.
- Harber, J. R. (1980). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward Black English. ERIC Document.

- Harber, J. R. (1981). The effect of cultural and linguistic differences on reading performance. In John Edwards (Ed.), The social psychology of reading. (Vol. 1). Silver Spring: Institute of Modern Languages Inc.
- Harber, Jean R., & Beatty, Jane N. (1978). Reading and the Black English speaking child: An annotated bibliography. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Harber, Jean R., & Bryen, Dianne N. (1976, Summer). Black English and the task of reading. Review of Educational Research, 46, (3), 387-405.
- Harvard Educational Review. (1980). Thought and Language; Language and reading. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Educational Review.
- Haugen, E. (1964). Bilingualism and bidialectalism. In Roger Shuy (Ed.), Social dialects and language learning. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Henderson, E. H., & Long, B. H. (1973). Academic expectancies, of Black and White teachers for Black and White first graders. Proceedings of the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 8, 687-688. Montreal, Canada.
- Henderson, Leslie. (1982). Orthography and word recognition in reading. New York, New York: Academic Press.
- Hockman, Carol H. (1973, March). Black dialect reading tests in the urban elementary school. Reading Teacher, 26, 581-583.
- Hooper, P. P., & Powell, E. R. (1971). Note on oral comprehension in standard and nonstandard English. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 33, 34.
- Housh, J. (1972). Delayed response time of Black third grade children in sentence imitation task of BE and SE. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley, California.
- Huey, E. B. (1908). The psychology and pedagogy of reading. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hunt, Barbara Carey. (1974). Black dialect and the Gray oral reading test. Reading Research Quarterly, 10 (1), 103-123.
- Hutchinson, June O'Shields. (1972, February). Reading tests and nonstandard language. Reading Teacher, 25, 430-431.



Hymes, Dell (Ed.). (1971). Pidginization and creolization of languages. Oxford, England: Cambridge University Press.

J:

Jaggar, A. M., & Cullman, B. F. (1975). A study of young Black children's receptive and productive language and reading competence in standard English grammatical forms. Final report, National Institute of Education, Project No. 3-1169, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare.

Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 39, 1-123.

Johnson, Dale L. (1974, June). The influence of social class and race on language test performance and spontaneous speech of preschool children. Child Development, 45, 517-521.

Johnson, Kenneth R. (1970). Social backgrounds of specific groups: Blacks. In Thomas D. Horn (Ed.), Reading for the disadvantaged: Problems of linguistically different learners (pp. 29-38). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc.

K:

Kachuk, B. L. (1975, November). Dialect in the language of inner-city children. Elementary School Journal, 76, 105-112.

Kachuck, B. L. (1977). Comparison of vocabulary of inner-city first-graders and first-grade texts. School of Education, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Kachuck, B. L. (1978, May). Black English and reading: Research issues. Education and Urban Society, 10 (3), 385-398.

Knapp, Margaret O. (1975, December). Black dialect and reading: What teachers need to know. Journal of Reading, 19, 231-236.

Kochman, T. (1969). Social factors in the consideration of teaching standard English. Florida F. L. Reporter, 7, (1), 87.

Kresbeck, J. D., & Nicolosi, L. (1973). A comparison of Black and White children's scores on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Language, Speech and Hearing Services in the Schools, 4, 37-40.



L:

- LaBerge, D., and Samuels, S. J. (1977). Basic processes in reading: Perceptions and comprehension. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Labov, William (1964). Stages in the acquisition of standard English. In Roger Shuy (Ed.), Social dialects and language learning (pp. 77-103). Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Labov, William. (1966). The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, William. (1967). Some sources of reading problems for Negro speakers of nonstandard English. In A. Frazier (Ed.), New directions in elementary English (pp. 140-167). Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Labov, William. (1969). Some sources of reading problems for Negro speakers of nonstandard English. In Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Black children to read (pp. 29-67). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, William. (1970). Language characteristics: Blacks. In D. Horn (Ed.), Reading for the disadvantaged. Problems of linguistically different learners. (pp. 139-157). New York: Harcourt Brace & World Inc.
- Labov, William. (1970). The reading of the -ed suffix. In Harry Levin and Joanna P. Williams (Eds.), Basic studies in reading (pp. 222-245). New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Labov, William. (1970). The logic of nonstandard English. In Frederick Williams (Ed.), Language and poverty: Perspectives on a theme (pp. 153-189). Chicago: Rand McNally Co.
- Labov, William. (1971). 'System' in creole language. In Dell Hymes (Ed.), Pidginization and creolization of language (pp. 447-472). Oxford, England: Cambridge University.
- Labov, William and Robbins, C. (1969). A note on the relation of reading failure to peer group status in urban ghettos. Teachers' College Record, 70, 395-405.
- Laffey, James L., & Shuy, Roger. (Eds.). (1973). Language differences: Do they interfere? Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

- Leaverton, Lloyd. (1973). Dialectal readers: Rationale, use and value. In James L. Laffey and Roger Shuy (Eds.), Language differences: Do they interfere? (pp. 114-126). Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.
- Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). Biological foundations of language. New York: Wiley.
- Levy, B. K. (1972). A comparison of selected oral language features of inner-city first grade children and the language of selected beginning reading instructional materials. Doctoral dissertation, New York University. (University Microfilms, No. 72-207-645).
- Levy, B. K. (1973). Is the oral language of inner-city children adequate for beginning reading instruction? Research in the Teaching of English, 7, 51-60.
- Levy, B. K. (1974). The oral language of first graders compared to the language of beginning reading texts. In Bernice E. Cullinan (Ed.), Black dialects and reading (pp. 29-40). Urbana, Il.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Light, Richard L. (1971, April). Some observations concerning Black English children's conversations. The English Record, 21, 155-167.
- Loban, Walter D. (1963). The language of elementary school children. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Lui, Stella S. F. (1975-1976, Winter). An investigation of oral reading miscues made by nonstandard dialect speaking Black children. Reading Research Quarterly, 11, 193-197.
- M:
- MacMillan, Robert W. (1970). Economic backgrounds: Their impact on school children. In Thomas D. Horn (ed.), Reading for the disadvantaged: Problems of linguistically different learners (pp. 49-74). New York: Harcourt Brace & World Inc.
- MacNeilage, P. F., (1970). Motor control of serial ordering of speech. Psychological Review, 77, 182.
- Marwit, W., & Newman, G. (1974). Black and White children's comprehension of standard and nonstandard English passages. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66, 329-332.

- Mathewson, G. (1973). The effects of attitudes upon comprehension of dialect folktales: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- McCarthy, D. (1954). Language development in children. In L. Carmichael (Ed.), Manual of child psychology, (2nd ed.), (pp. 492-630). New York: Wiley.
- McDavid, Raven Jr. (1969). Dialectology and the teaching of reading. In Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Black children to read (pp. 1-139). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- McLaughlin, Barry. (1978). Second-language acquisition in childhood. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McNeill, D. (1970). The acquisition of language. New York: Harper and Row.
- McNeill, D. (1970a). The development of language. New York: Harper and Row.
- McNeill, D. (1970b). The acquisition of language: The study of developmental psycholinguistics. New York: Harper and Row.
- Mehler, J. (1971). Studies in language and thought development. In R. Huxley and E. Ingram (Eds.), Language acquisition: Models and methods (pp. 201-225). New York: Academic Press.
- Melmed, P. J. (1971). Black English phonology: The question of reading interference. Berkeley, California: Monographs of Language Behavior Research Laboratory.
- Menyuk, P. (1968b). The role of distinctive features in children's acquisition of phonology. Journal of Speech Hearing Research, 11, 138.
- Menyuk, Paula. (1969). Sentences children use. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.
- Menyuk, Paula. (1971). The acquisition and development of language. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Menyuk, Paula. (1977). Language and maturation. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Metfessel, Newton S., & Seng, Mark W. (1970). Correlates with the school success and failure of economically disadvantaged children. In Thomas D. Horn (Ed.), Reading for the disadvantaged: Problems of linguistically different learners (pp. 75-96). New York: Harcourt Brace & World Inc.

Monteith, Mary K. (1980). Black English, teacher attitudes, and reading. Language Arts, 57, 908-912.

Morris, Halle & Chomsky, Noam. (1968). The sound pattern of English. New York: Harper & Row.

Murray, Frank B., & Pikulski, John J. (1978). The acquisition of reading. Baltimore: University Park Press.

N:

Nolen, P. S. (1972). Reading nonstandard dialect materials: A study of grades two and four. Child Development, 43, 1092-1097.

Nurss, Joanne R., & Day, David E. (1971, February). Imitation, comprehension, and production of grammatical structures. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 10, 68-74.

O:

Ornstein, Galicia J. (1980). Black English--New role in the classroom? Curriculum Review, 1 (3), 204-209.

Osser, Harry, Wang, Marilyn D., & Zaid, Farida. (1979, December). The young child's ability to imitate and comprehend speech: A comparison of two subcultural groups. Child Development, 40, 1063-1076.

P:

Padak, N. D. (1981). The language and educational needs of children who speak Black English. Reading Teacher, 35, 144-151.

Palermo, D. D., and Molfese, D. L. (1972). Language acquisition from age five onward. Psychological Bulletin, 78, 409.

Peisach, E. C. (1969). Children's comprehension of teacher and peer speech. Child Development, 36, 467-480.

Piestrup, A. M. (1973). Black dialect interference and accommodation of reading instruction in first grade. Monographs of the Language Behaviour Research Laboratory. Berkeley, California.

Peskin, M. E. (1974). Interaction of dialect, SES and ethnicity upon listening and reading comprehension of fifth graders. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 4578A-4579A. (University Microfilms, No. 73-32, 232).

Petyt, K. M. (1980). The study of dialect. London: Andre Deutsch Ltd.

Politzer, Richard L., Hoover, Mary R., & Brown, Dwight. (1974, March). A test of proficiency in Black standard and non-standard speech. Tesol Quarterly, 8, 27-35.

Premack, D., & Premack, A. (1974). Teaching visual language to apes and language deficient persons. In R. Schiefelbusch and L. Lloyd (Eds.), Language perspectives: Acquisition, retardation and intervention (pp. 347-376). Baltimore: University Park Press.

Pride, J. B. (Ed.). (1979). Sociolinguistic aspects of language learning and teaching. Oxford: University Press.

Q:

Quay, Lorene C. (1972, March). Negro dialect and the Binet performance in severely disadvantaged Black four-year olds. Child Development, 43, 245-250.

R:

Ramer, Andrya L. H., & Rees, Norma S. (1973, December). Selected aspects of the development of English morphology in Black American children of low socioeconomic background. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 16, 569-577.

Ramphal, Kennard. (1983). An analysis of reading instruction of W.I. creole speaking students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada.

Ramsey, Imogene. (1972, May). A comparison of first grade Negro dialect speakers' comprehension of SE and Negro dialect. Elementary English, 49, 688-696.

Raph, Jane B. (1967). Language and speech deficits in culturally disadvantaged children and their implication for the speech clinician. Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders, 32, 203-214.

Raymond, James C. (1982). Literacy as a human problem. Alabama. University of Alabama Press.

Rentel, V., & Kennedy, J. (1972). Effects of pattern drill on the phonology, syntax, and reading achievement of rural Appalachian children. American Educational Research Journal, 9, 87-100.

- Resnick, Daniel P., & Resnick, Lauren B. (1980). The nature of literacy: An historical exploration in thought and language and language and reading. Harvard Educational Review. (pp. 396-411). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.
- Reynolds, Ralph E., Taylor, Marsha A., Steffenson, Margaret S., Larry, Shirley L., & Anderson, Richard C. (1982). Cultural schemata and reading comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 17, 353-366.
- Riessman, Frank. (1976). The inner-city child. New York: Harper & Row.
- Robinson, Helen, (1946). Why pupils fail in reading. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rogers, C. R. (1961). On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rosen, Carl L., & Ames, Wilbur S. (1972). Influence of nonstandard dialect on the oral reading behavior of fourth grade Black children under two stimuli conditions. In J. Allen Figurel (Ed.), Better reading in urban schools (pp. 45-55). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rubovits, Oamela C., & Maehr, Martin L. (1973). Pygmalion Black and White. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25, 210-218.
- Ruddell, R. B. (1976). Psycholinguistics implications for a systems of communication model. In H. Singer and R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading. Newark, D. E.: International Reading Association.
- Rutherford, William. (1970). Teaching reading to children with dialect differences. In J. A. Figurel (Ed.), Reading goals for the disadvantaged. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Rystrom, R. C. (1969). Testing Negro-standard English dialect differences. Reading Research Quarterly, 4, 500-511.
- Rystrom, Richard. (1970, Summer). Dialect training and reading A further look. Reading Research Quarterly, 4, 581-599.

S:

- Schaaf, E. (1971). A study of Black English syntax and reading comprehension. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- Schwartz, Judith I. (1982, February). Dialect interferences in the attainment of literacy. Journal of Reading, 25, 440-446.
- Seymour, Dorothy Z. (1973). Neutralizing the effect of the non-standard dialect. In James L. Laffey and Roger Shuy (Eds.), Language differences: Do they interfere? (pp. 149-162). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Shields, Portia H. (1979). The language of poor Black children and reading. Journal of Negro Education, 48, 196-208.
- Shilling, A. (1978). Some nonstandard features of Bahamian dialect syntax. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hawaii.
- Shuy, Roger W. (Ed.). (1964). Social dialects and language learning. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Shuy, Roger W. (1969). A linguistic background for developing beginning reading materials for Black children. In Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy Eds.), Teaching Black children to read (pp. 117-137). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Shuy, Robert. (1973). Nonstandard dialect problems. In James L. Laffey and Roger Shuy (Eds.), Language differences: Do they interfere? Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Shuy, Roger W. (1980). Vernacular Black English: Setting the issues in time. In Marcia Farr Whiteman (Ed.) Reactions to Ann Arbor: Vernacular Black English and education (pp. 1-9). Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Simons, H. D. (1974). Black dialect phonology and word recognition. Journal of Educational Research, 68, 67-70.
- Simons, H. D. (1979). Black dialect, reading interference, and classroom interaction. In Lauren B. Resnick and Phyllis A Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading (Vol. 3), (pp. 111-129). Hillside, N.J.: Erlbaum Association.



- Simons, H., & Johnson, K. (1974). Black English syntax and reading interference. Research in the Teaching of English, 8, 339-358.
- Simpkins, Gary A., & Simpkins, Charlesetta. (1981). Cross-cultural approach to curriculum development. In Geneva Smitherman. (Ed.), Black English and the education of Black children and youth (pp. 213-240). Detroit: Center for Black Studies.
- Sims, Rudine (1972). A psycholinguistic description of miscues created by selected young readers during oral reading of text in Black dialect and standard English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University.
- Sims, Rudine. (1976). What we know about dialects and reading. In P. David Allen (Ed.), Findings of research in miscue analysis: Classroom implications (pp. 128-131). Urbana, Il.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Sims, Rudine. (1982). Dialect and reading: Toward redefining the issues. In Judith A. Langer and M. Trika Smith-Burke (Eds.). Reader meets author/bridging the gap: A psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspective (pp. 222-236). Newark, Delaware: I.R.A.
- Slobin, Dan I. (1967). A field manual for cross-cultural study of the acquisition of communicative competence. Berkeley, California: University of California.
- Slobin, D. (1971b). Developmental psycholinguistics. In W. Dingwall (Ed.), A survey of linguistic science (pp. 299-400). College Park: University of Maryland.
- Slobin, D. (1973). Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar. In C. Ferguson and D. Slobin (Eds.), Studies of child language development (pp. 175-208). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Smith, Frank. (1972). The learner and his language. In Richard E. Hodges and E. Hugh Rudorf (Eds.), Language and learning to read; What teachers should know about language (pp. 35-43). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Smith, Frank. (1978). Reading. London; Cambridge University.
- Smith, Frank & Goodman, Kenneth S. (1973). On the psycholinguistic method of teaching reading. In Eldon E. Ekwall (Compiler), Psychological factors in the teaching of reading (pp. 303-308). Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.



- Smitherman, Geneva. (1980). White English in Black face or who do I be? In Leonard Michaels and Christine Ricks (Eds.), The state of language (pp. 158-168). Berkeley, California: University of California.
- Smitherman, Geneva. (Ed.). (1981). Black English and the Education of Black children and youth. Detroit: Center for Black Studies.
- Smitherman, Geneva. (1981, February). What go round come round: King in perspective. Harvard Educational Review, 51, (1), 40-56.
- Smolins, G. (1974). Reading and Comprehension: A Comparative Study of some 8 to 9 year old children of English and West Indian origin. Master's thesis, Berbeck College, London.
- Snow, K. (1969). Unfinished pygmalion. Contemporary Psychology, 14, 197-199.
- Somervill, Mary Ann. (1975). Dialect and reading: A review of alternative solutions. Review of Educational Research, 45 (2), 247-262.
- Spache, George D. (1976). Investigating the issues of reading disabilities. Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc.
- Stauffer, Russell G. (1975). Directing the reading thinking process. New York, N.Y.: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Stedman, Donald J. (1976, July). Important considerations in the review and evaluation of educational intervention programs. Viewpoints, 52 (4), 1-14.
- Stephens, Irene M. (1976, September). Elicited imitation of selected features of two American English dialects in Headstart children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 19, 493-508.
- Stewart, William A. (1964). Urban Negro speech: Sociolinguistic factors affecting English teaching. In Roger W. Shuy (Ed.), Social dialects and language learning. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Stewart, William A. (1969). On the use of Negro dialect in the teaching of reading. In Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Black children to read (pp. 157-219). Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Stewart, William A. (1970). Foreign language teaching methods in quasi-foreign language situations. In Ralph W. Fasold & Roger W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching standard English in the Inner-city (pp. 1-19). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Stewart, William A. (1970- Spring-Fall). Current issues in the use of Negro dialect in beginning reading texts. Florida F. L. Reporter, 8 (3-7), 46.

Strickland, Ruth G. (1962, July). The language of elementary school children. Bulletin of the School of Education. Indiana University 38 (4), 1-131.

T:

Tatham, S. M. (1970, Spring). Reading comprehension of materials written with select oral language patterns: A study at grades two and four. Reading Research Quarterly, 5, 402-426.

Taylor, Monica J. (1981). Caught between: A review of research into the education of pupils of West Indian origin. Great Britain: Nelson.

Townsend, H., & Brittan, E. M. (1972). Organization in multi-racial schools. Sussex, Great Britain: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Tough, J. (1977). The development of meaning: A study of children's use of language. New York: Halstead Press.

Troike, R. C. (1976). Receptive bidialectism: Implications for second dialect teaching. In N. A. Johnson (Ed.), Current topics in language. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishing Company.

Troutman, Denise E., Falk, Julia S. (1982). Speaking Black English and reading--Is there a problem of interference? The Journal of Negro Education, 51, 123-133.

Trudgill, Peter. (1974). An introduction to sociolinguistics. Middlesex, England. Hazell, Watson & Viney Ltd.

V:

Venezky, R. L. (1967). English orthography: It's graphical structure and its relation to sound. Reading Research Quarterly, 2, 27-106.

- Venezky, R. L. (1977). Research on the reading process: An historical perspective. American Psychologist, 32, 339-345.
- Venezky, R. L. (1979). Nonstandard language and reading--ten years later. In John R. Edwards (Ed.), The Social Psychology of reading. Silver Spring, Md.: Institute of Modern Languages Inc.
- Venezky, R. L. (1981). Nonstandard language and reading: Ten years later. In John Edwards (Ed.), The social psychology of reading: Language and literacy (pp. 193-205). Silver Springs, Maryland. Institute of Modern Languages Inc.
- Venezky, R. L., Calfee, Robert C., & Chapman, Robin S. (1970). Skills required for learning to read. In Doris V. Gunderson (Compiler), Language and Reading: An Interdisciplinary approach (pp. 37-54). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Venezky, R. L. & Chapman, Robin S. (1973). Is learning to read dialect bound? In James L. Laffey and Roger Shuy (Eds.), Language differences: Do they interfere? (pp. 62-69). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- W:
- Walker, L. (1975). Newfoundland dialect interference in oral reading. Journal of Reading Behaviour, 7, 61-78.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. (1969). Some linguistic insights into reading instruction (pp. 110-112). Florida G. L. Reporter Inc.
- Waterhouse, Lynn H., Fischer, Karen M., Ryan, Ellen Bouchard. (1980). Language awareness and reading. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Weber, R. M. (1970). Some reservations on the significance of dialect in the acquisition of reading. In J. A. Figurel (Ed.), Reading goal for the disadvantaged (pp. 124-131). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Weber, Rose Marie. (1973). Linguistics and reading. In Eldon E. Ekwall (Compiler), Psychological factors in the teaching of reading (pp. 268-291). Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- Webber, R. D. (1979). An overview of language attitude studies with special reference to teachers' language attitude. Educational Review, 31 (3), 217-232.

- Weinberg, M. (1977). Minority students: A research appraisal. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing.
- Weiner, M. & Cromer, W. (1970). Reading and reading difficulties. In Doris V. Gunderson (Compiler), Language and reading: An interdisciplinary approach (pp. 136-162). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wells, Gordon, (1981). Learning through interaction: The study of language development. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, Gordon. (1982). Influences of the home on language development. In Alan Davies (Ed.), Language and learning in home and school. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Wells, Gordon. (1984). The sense of story. In Learning to talk and talking to learn (Chapter 6), Draft manuscript.
- Williams, F., Hewett, N., Hopper, R., Miller, L., Naremore, R., Whitehead, J. L. (1976). Explorations of the linguistic attitudes of teachers. Rowley, Massachusetts: House Publishers.
- Williams, Frederick. (Ed.). (1970). Language and poverty: Perspectives on a theme. Chicago: Rand McNally Co.
- Winks, Robert W. (1971). The Blacks in Canada. Montreal, Canada: Yale University Press.
- Wolf, Robert L., & Tymitz, Barbara L. (1976-1977). Ethnography and reading: Matching inquiry mode to process. Reading Research Quarterly, 12 (1), 5-11.
- Wolfram, Walter A. (1970). Sociolinguistic alternatives in teaching reading to nonstandard speakers. Florida F. L. Reporter, 48, 16-23.
- Wolfram, Walter, & Clarke, N. (Eds.). (1970). Black White speech relationships. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wolfram, Walter A., & Fasold, Ralph W. (1969). Reading materials for speakers of Black English. In Joan C. Baratz, and Roger W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for applied Linguistics.

Wolfram, Walter, & Fasold, Ralph W. (1974). The study of social dialects in American English. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Wolfram, Walter, Potter, L., Yanofsky, N. M., & Shuy, R. W. (1979). Reading and dialect differences. Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wright, Grace E. (1969). Models of language: Teaching of English in Jamaica. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Toronto,, Canada.

Z:

Zuck, Louis V., & Goodman, Yetta M. (Compilers). (1971). Social class and regional dialects: Their relationships to reading (An annotated bibliography). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

